Class 232.34 Book C315
General Theological Seminary Library
Ninth Ave. and 20th St., New York.
Beside the main topic, this book also treats of

Subject No.	*On page*	*Subject No.*	*On page*

PRESENTED BY
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING RELIGION and LEARNING

THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE AND ATONEMENT.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, ... HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.
DUBLIN, ... GEORGE HERBERT.
NEW YORK, ... SCRIBNER AND WELFORD.

THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE

OF

SACRIFICE AND ATONEMENT.

BY

ALFRED CAVE, B.A., D.D.,

AUTHOR OF "THE INSPIRATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT INDUCTIVELY CONSIDERED;"
"AN INTRODUCTION TO THEOLOGY, ITS PRINCIPLES, ITS BRANCHES,
ITS RESULTS, AND ITS LITERATURE," ETC.,

AND

PRINCIPAL AND PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY OF HACKNEY COLLEGE.

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

NEW EDITION,

REVISED THROUGHOUT AND PARTLY RE-WRITTEN.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
1890.

232.3Q
C315

21399

PREFACE TO FIRST EDITION.

—o—

IN books not a few which have been written upon the Sacrificial Worship of the Old Testament, upon the Sacrifice of Christ, and upon the Sacrifices of the Christian Church, it has been forgotten that no one of these subjects can be advantageously studied without the others. Nevertheless, it stands to reason, that to describe the ceremonial of Judaism, for example, apart from the cardinal doctrines of Christianity, is like writing a history of the acorn and saying nothing of the oak to which it grows; it stands to reason that the theologian who defines the Christian doctrine of the Atonement without reference to the expiatory features of Mosaism, might as wisely undertake a philosophical biography and ignore the entire story of childhood, and the early display of hereditary tendencies; it even stands to reason that he who hopes to state the Christian doctrine of Priesthood or Unbloody Sacrifice without an exhaustive and methodical inquiry into that symbolical system which has provided the very names of his subject-matter, might as rationally hope to study English scientifically without a knowledge of Anglo-Saxon, or Geology without a previous acquaintance without Mineralogy.

With a view, therefore, to his own intellectual satisfaction in the first place, and in the second to the filling of an undesirable void in our theological literature, the Author has

attempted an investigation into the scriptural doctrine of Sacrifice in all its dissimilitude and completeness. Of course, the Author is aware that this subject has received cursory elucidation in numerous systems of Theology and Philosophy; but the lack of detail, the necessitated avoidance of the historical method, and the incorporation of things extra-biblical, rendered, in his esteem, such treatment inadequate. Nor was the series of sermons on "The Doctrine of Sacrifice deduced from the Scriptures," by the lamented F. D. Maurice, admirable as those discourses were in spirit and ingenious in practical applications, of sufficient accuracy or fulness to preclude further research. In the following pages a tentative inquiry is undertaken, the characteristic feature of which is the desire to exhibit the several phases of Scriptural Sacrifice, in all their fundamental resemblance and gradational difference, from the days of Adam to those of the Apostle John—nay, if the testimony of the apostles be received, to the undeclining day of the New Jerusalem.

1877.

PREFACE TO THIS EDITION.

EVERY page in this edition has been carefully revised in the light of the latest relative researches. The literary references have also been brought down to date.

In the Old Testament section comparatively little change has been needful, although important additions have been made to the chapters on "The Mosaic Injunctions" and "The Essential Significance of the Mosaic Injunctions."

In the New Testament section, however, there is considerable variation. Upon the Doctrine of the Atonement especially, conclusions upon which affect so materially the presentation of Christian truth, the author's views have been steadily ripening, as he believes, during the thought of years. Consequently more than half of the New Testament portion has been re-written, much therein being now presented somewhat fully which was but hinted at in the earlier edition. Many additions will be found in the history of the doctrine of Atonement. Further, a new synthesis of the New Testament data for a doctrine of the Atonement has been attempted.

One point more. It has been the desire of the Author to write this book, or he has endeavoured to write whatever he has written, as a member of the great Church Catholic. He has been rewarded, beyond his dreaming, by a catholic reception of a very appreciative kind. He renders thanks to the

Giver of all mercies. May this book in its new form, he would pray, so far as it is a just interpreter of Holy Scripture, continue to aid Christian thought, whether upon the Supreme Sacrifice of our dear Lord, or upon those lower sacrifices of ours to which His great love constrains us!

HACKNEY COLLEGE, LONDON, N.W.,
May 1890.

CONTENTS.

—o—

INTRODUCTION.

	PAGE
Statement of Subject,	17
Method of Investigation—	
(1) Biblico-Theological,	18
(2) Critical,	20
Importance of Inquiry in apprehending—	
(1) Bible,	21
(2) Judaism,	23
(3) Atonement,	24
(4) Sacerdotalism,	25
Definition of Sacrifice,	26
Division of this Treatise,	27

BOOK I.—PREPARATORY.

PART I.—THE PATRIARCHAL DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE.

Chap. I.—The Origin of Sacrifice.

Difficulty in apprehending pre-Mosaic Age,	31
Primitive Sacrifice not evolutional,	32
Paradisaic, the Ideal and Original Sacrifice,	33
The Sacrifice of Abel, the Original Animal Sacrifice,	34

Chap. II.—The Development and Significance of Patriarchal Sacrifice.

Development of Abel's Sacrifice,	44
On Subjective Side,	45
On Objective Side,	45
Corrective Revelation granted to Abraham,	47
Patriarchal Sacrifice and the Remission of Sins,	48
Patriarchal Sacrifice and the Religious Life,	53
Summary of Patriarchal Doctrine,	53

PART II.—THE MOSAIC DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE.

CHAP. I.—THE MOSAIC INJUNCTIONS.

PAGE

Mosaic, an Advance upon Patriarchal Sacrifice, ... 59
The Transitional Sacrifices—
(1) The Passover, ... 60
(2) The Covenant Sacrifice, ... 61
Difficulties of Study of Mosaic Sacrifice, ... 63
Division of the Mosaic Injunctions, ... 63
The Mosaic Injunctions concerning—
(1) The Place of Sacrifice—the Tabernacle, ... 64
(2) The Sacrificial Ministrants, ... 69
1. The Levites, ... 69
2. The Priests, ... 70
3. The High Priest, ... 71
(3) The Legal Preparations for Sacrifice—Purifications, . . 72
(4) The Sacrifices themselves, ... 76
A. From Standpoint of Material—
a. The Blood Sacrifices—
1. The Burnt-Offering, ... 77
2. The Peace-Offering, ... 78
3. The Sin-Offering, ... 79
4. The Trespass-Offering, ... 80
b. The Bloodless Sacrifices, ... 81
B. From Standpoint of Offerers—
1. National Sacrifices, ... 83
2. Official Sacrifices, ... 84
3. Individual Sacrifices, ... 84
(5) The Sacrificial Times and Seasons, ... 85
Summary of Chapter—the Jewish Calendar of Sacrifice, . . 88

CHAP. II.—THE ESSENTIAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MOSAIC INJUNCTIONS.

The Mosaic Sacrifices had reference to the Religious Life of the Jew, . 91
That reference partly seen in the Essential Significance, . . 92
The Essential Significance of—
(1) The Tabernacle, ... 93
(2) The Priesthood, ... 96
(3) The Purifications, ... 98
(4) The Sacrifices, ... 101
a. Generally—
1. As Presentations, ... 101
2. As Atonements, ... 101
b. Specifically—
1. As Burnt-Offerings, ... 104
2. As Peace-Offerings, ... 105
3. As Sin-Offerings, ... 106
4. As Trespass-Offerings, ... 109
5. As Bloodless Offerings, ... 109
(5) The Sacrificial Times and Seasons, ... 110
Summary of Chapter, ... 113

CHAP. III.—THE SYMBOLIC SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MOSAIC INJUNCTIONS.

PAGE
The Mosaic Sacrifices Symbolic, ... 115
The Canon for the Study of this Symbolism, ... 116
Where Symbolism is to be expected, ... 118
The Symbolical Significance of Details of—
(1) The Tabernacle, ... 120
(2) The Priesthood, ... 124
(3) The Purifications, ... 126
(4) The Sacrifices, ... 128
a. The Blood Sacrifices—
I. As to their Ritual, viz.—
1. The Presentation, ... 128
2. The Imposition of the Hand, ... 128
3. The Aspersion of the Blood, ... 129
4. The Combustion, ... 131
5. The Concluding Meal, ... 132
Summary, ... 132
II. As to their Several Species—
1. The Sin-Offering, ... 133
2. The Trespass-Offering, ... 134
3. The Burnt-Offering, ... 135
4. The Peace-Offering, ... 136
Summary, ... 136
b. The Bloodless Sacrifices, ... 137
(5) The Sacrificial Times and Seasons, ... 140

CHAP. IV.—THE SACRAMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MOSAIC INJUNCTIONS.

The Relation of the Mosaic Sacrifices to the Remission of Sins, . . 143
(1) The Nature of the Mosaic Atonement, ... 144
(2) Its Method, ... 144
(3) Its Extent, ... 148
(4) Its Efficacy, ... 151
The Relation of the Mosaic Sacrifices to the Religious Life of the Offerers, 153
Summary, ... 156

CHAP. V.—THE TYPICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MOSAIC INJUNCTIONS.

The Mosaic Sacrificial Injunctions have a Typical as well as an Essential, a Symbolic, and a Sacramental Significance, . . . 158
The Nature of a Type, ... 161
The Value of Types *before* and *after* the Appearance of their Antitype, . 164
The Mosaic Sacrifices contain an Element of Prophecy, . . . 164
This Element of Prophecy seen—
(1) In the Contrast between Mosaism and Promise to Abraham, . 166
(2) In the Contrast between Mosaism and Promise at Sinai, . 166
(3) In the Contrast between Mosaic Symbols and Things symbolized, 167
(4) In the Contrast between Law and Practice, . . . 169
Summary and Conclusion, ... 171

CHAP. VI.—GENERAL REVIEW OF THE MOSAIC SACRIFICIAL INJUNCTIONS, 173

PART III.—THE POST-MOSAIC DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE.

Chap. I.—The National Conception of Mosaic Sacrifice.

PAGE

The Post-Mosaic Times a Period of Assimilation, . . . 183
The Assimilation effected by the National History—
(1) During the Lifetime of Moses, ... 185
(2) During the Lifetime of Joshua, ... 186
(3) During the Times of the Judges, ... 186
(4) During the Times of the Undivided Monarchy, . . . 187
(5) During the Times of the Divided Monarchy—
1. In Israel, ... 189
2. In Judah, ... 190

Chap. II.—The Hagiographic Conception of Mosaic Sacrifice.

The Assimilation of the Mosaic Doctrine also aided by the Hagiographa and their Authors, ... 193
Division of the Hagiographa into Historical and Poetical Books, . 194
The Historical Books aided Assimilation—
(1) By acknowledging the Religious Satisfaction to be found in Mosaic Sacrifice, ... 195
(2) By Recognition of Subjective Side of Sacrifice, . . . 196
The Poetical Books aided Assimilation—
(1) By also acknowledging the Religious Satisfaction to be found in Mosaic Sacrifice, ... 197
(2) By exposing the Folly of Iniquitous Observance, . . 198
(3) By Recognition of Subjective Side of Sacrifice, . . . 199
(4) By their Messianic Conceptions, ... 200

Chap. III.—The Prophetical Conception of Mosaic Sacrifice.

The Task of Prophecy in relation to Mosaic Sacrifice, . . . 204
The Nature of Prophecy, ... 205
A Corollary from this Definition, ... 206
The Task of Prophecy double—Assimilative and Developmental, . 208
The Prophetical Writings aided Assimilation—
(1) By reiterating the Importance of Sacrifice as a Mode of Worship, ... 209
(2) By delineating the Consequences of Iniquitous Observance, . 209
(3) By recognising Importance of Subjective Side, . . . 210
(4) By announcing Transitional Nature, ... 211
(5) By Messianic Conceptions, ... 211
The Prophetical Writings aided Development—
(1) By uniting the Messianic and Sacrificial Teaching, . . 213
(2) By predicting the Time when this Union would take place, . 219

CHAP. IV.—OTHER THEORIES OF OLD TESTAMENT SACRIFICE REVIEWED.

PAGE

A Review of other Theories advisable, ... 225
Classification of other Theories, ... 225
The Allegorical and Biblico-Theological to be considered, . . 227
General Review of Allegorical Theories, ... 227
The Allegorizing of Origen, ... 227
His numerous Followers, ... 232
Origin of the Method, ... 232
Its Failings, ... 234
Transition to the Biblico-Theological Theories, ... 237
Spencer's *De Legibus Hebræorum*, ... 237
Outram's *De Sacrificiis*, ... 244
Lowman's *Rational of the Hebrew Ritual*, ... 246
General Review of Biblico-Theological Theories, ... 248
Bähr's *Symbolik des Mos. Cultus*, ... 248
Hengstenberg's *Beiträgen zur Einleitung ins A. T.*, . . . 255
Followers of Bähr and Hengstenberg, ... 256
Kurtz, *Alttestamentliche Opfercultus*, ... 256
Summary, ... 258
Naturalistic School, ... 259

CHAP. V.—THE TRANSITION, ... 261

BOOK II.—PLEROMATIC.

CHAP. I.—THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE GENERALLY CONSIDERED.

General Character of the New Testament Teaching, . . . 269
That Teaching divisible into Two Parts, viz. that concerning Christ and that concerning Man, ... 269
General Illustration of the Sacrifice ascribed to Christ, . . . 270
General Illustration of the Sacrifice ascribed to Man, . . . 272

CHAP. II.—THE NEW TESTAMENT DESCRIPTION OF THE ATONING WORK OF CHRIST AS SACRIFICIAL.

The Method of Examination—
(1) Linguistic, ... 273
(2) Biblico-Theological, ... 276
Thus examined, the Work of Christ is seen to be described throughout the New Testament as in some sense Sacrificial, viz.—
(1) In Teaching of John the Baptist, ... 277
(2) In Teaching of Jesus, ... 278
(3) In Teaching of James and Jude (by Implication), . . . 280
(4) In Teaching of Peter, ... 281

PAGE
(5) In Teaching of Paul, ... 283
(6) In Teaching of John, ... 286
(7) In Teaching of Authors of Epistle to the Hebrews and the Revelation, ... 287
Summary, ... 288

CHAP. III.—THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT.

The Extraction of such a Doctrine necessary, ... 290
Method, twofold, ... 291
I. The Doctrine of the New Testament Writers singly—
(1) According to Peter, ... 292
(2) According to Paul, ... 294
(3) According to John, ... 299
II. The Doctrine of the New Testament as a whole—
(1) As to Necessity, ... 303
(2) As to Nature, ... 307
(3) As to Effects, ... 317
(4) As to *Modus Operandi*, ... 318
(5) As to Extent, ... 319
(6) As related to the Doctrines of Man and of Sin, . . 319

CHAP. IV.—CRITICAL REVIEW OF THEORIES OF ATONEMENT.

Equivocal Use of the Word *Theory*, ... 326
Examination of Theories, viz.—
(1) Ante-Nicene, ... 331
(2) Gnostic, ... 334
(3) Patristic, ... 337
(4) Of Anselm, ... 340
(5) Of Aquinas, ... 344
(6) Of Duns Scotus, ... 345
(7) Of Abelard, ... 347
(8) Of Reformers, ... 349
(9) Hyper-Calvinist—*a*. John Owen, ... 350
b. Crisp, ... 354
c. Modified, ... 355
(10) Socinian, ... 356
(11) Arminian—*a*. Grotius, ... 360
b. Limborch and Curcellæus, . . . 364
(12) Moderate Calvinist, ... 366
(13) Modern Arminian, ... 370

CHAP. V.—CONTEMPORARY DOCTRINES OF THE ATONEMENT: THE THEORIES OF BUSHNELL, CAMPBELL, AND DALE.

Classification of Theories of the Atonement, ... 371
M'Leod Campbell's *Nature of the Atonement*, ... 376
Bushnell's *Vicarious Sacrifice and Forgiveness of Law*, . . 388
Dale's *Congregational Union Lecture*, ... 403

CHAP. VI.—THE ATONEMENT OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT COMPARED.

PAGE

The Connection between the Old and New Testament Sacrifices twofold —of Figures and Things figured, of Type and Antitype, . . 418
The Figurative Description of Work of Christ—
(1) In Figures borrowed from the Tabernacle, . . . 420
(2) In Figures borrowed from the Priesthood, . . . 421
(3) In Figures borrowed from the Purification, . . . 422
(4) In Figures borrowed from the Sacrifices, . . . 423
The Antitypical Description of the Work of Christ, . . . 425
Nature of *Type* and *Antitype*, ... 426
The Atonement of the New, *antitypical* of that of the Old—
I. *Probably*, as seen in—
(1) Transitional Nature of Mosaism, ... 428
(2) Transitional Nature of Prophecy, ... 428
(3) Fulfilments of Prophecy, ... 429
(4) New Testament Views of Judaism, ... 429
(5) Exclusive Nature of both, ... 430
(6) Explication in New of Unexplained Features of Old, . . 431
II. *Certainly*, as seen in a Comparison—
(1) As to Nature of Atonement in both, ... 434
(2) As to Method of Atonement in both, ... 434
(3) As to Extent of Atonement in both, ... 435
(4) As to Efficacy of Atonement in both, ... 436
Summary, ... 436

CHAP. VII.—CHRISTIAN SACRIFICES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Lives and Labours of Christian Believers described under Scriptural Analogies, ... 438
Apostolic Doctrine of State of Man under the Gospel according to—
(1) Teaching of our Lord, ... 442
(2) Teaching of John, ... 443
(3) Teaching of Paul, ... 443
(4) Teaching of Peter, James, and Jude, ... 445
General Conclusions, ... 448

CHAP. VIII.—CHRISTIAN SACRIFICES UNDER THE NEW AND OLD COVENANTS.

Christian Sacrifices figuratively described, ... 449
The more Scientific Employment of Sacrificial Analogies, . . 451
The one Guiding Principle in this more Scientific Use, . . . 453
(1) The Priests antitypically considered, ... 454
(2) The Purifications antitypically considered, . . . 455
(3) The Sacrifices antitypically considered—
1. As to their Ritual, ... 455
2. As to their Species, ... 456
Summary, ... 457

CHAP. IX.—THE SACRIFICE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

PAGE
Human Sacrifices sacramental, ... 459
The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, ... 462
The Questions controverted, ... 463
Consideration of these Questions—the Scriptural Evidence, . . 463
Was the Rite of the Eucharist a Sacrifice? 464
First, was the Eucharist in any way Sacrificial? . . . 464
Secondly, in what Sense was the Eucharist Sacrificial? . . . 468

CHAP. X.—A REVIEW OF OTHER VIEWS UPON THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

Classification of Theories—
(1) The Romanist Theory, ... 472
(2) The Lutheran Theory, ... 482
(3) The Zwinglian Theory, ... 485
(4) The Socinian Theory, ... 486
(5) The Calvinistic Theory, ... 487
Summary of New Testament Doctrine of Human Sacrifice, . . 488

CHAP. XI.—SACRIFICE IN THE HEAVENLY WORLD.

The New Testament Doctrine of Sacrifice generally considered, . . 490
That Doctrine the Postulate to be assumed in Old Testament, . . 491
That Doctrine non-Transitional in Time, ... 492
That Doctrine projected into Eternity, ... 493
Completion of Cycle of Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice, . . . 494

CHAP. XII.—THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE.

Conclusion, ... 497

APPENDIX.

I. On the Hebrew Sacrificial Terminology and its Hellenistic Equivalents, ... 505
II. On Azazel, ... 521
III. On Jewish Interpretation of Isaiah liii., ... 524
IV. On the Seventy Weeks, ... 529

INDEX, ... 533

INTRODUCTION.

"Scientia est secundum modum cognoscentis."—AQUINAS, *Summa Theologica*, Pt. I. Quæst. xiv. Art. 1.

OUR subject is the *Scriptural* Doctrine of Sacrifice. With the Rabbinic, Patristic, Tridentine, Augsburg, Socinian, or Westminster doctrine we are only indirectly concerned, as each may serve to elucidate the teaching of Holy Writ. Still less have we to do with that comparative method, now so much in vogue, which forms its estimate of truth from the *consensus* of all religions. The Bible is our *fons et judex*,—the *source* or the *test* of all opinions legitimate to our inquiry. Our aim is dogmatic, not apologetic. The whole subsequent discussion will be conducted on the assumption of the historic value and accuracy of the books of Scripture. Not that we are unaware of the assertions of "criticism." We have heard much of the hypotheses of "pious frauds," "adroit manipulations," "literary fictions;" but, without giving reasons here why we regard such assertions as "*idola theatri*" (to accept Bacon's phrase),—without even delaying to state at length that we cannot imagine how religiously-minded Jews or Christians could append a "Thus saith the Lord" to their own political or ecclesiastical surmises,—we content ourselves with saying that we do not at present concern ourselves with these views, although something will be said upon these views in the course of the discussion. Our task is to ask, not, "Are the scriptural statements upon Sacrifice credible?" but, "What do the Scriptures really teach upon Sacrifice?" It may be that we shall be advancing the cause of truth by such

an objective examination. As has been well if unfamiliarly said, "Material Canonics" (Biblical Theology) "has both the right and the power to exercise a salutary and invigorating reaction upon the many vacillations into which Formal Canonics" (Biblical Introduction) "is still frequently betrayed."[1] What the Bible actually does contain, may not improbably put some restraint upon theories as to what it should contain.

The following treatise will thus assume the form, with its accompanying weaknesses and advantages, of a monographic contribution to Biblical Theology. The appropriate method is at once suggested. Biblical Theology owes its separate existence in the organism of theological sciences to its rigorous adhesion to inductive reasoning. Accepting the truths of Scripture as the man of science accepts the phenomena of nature,—as facts, that is, which it is his duty to explain, not to explain away,—the Biblical Theologian sets himself to ascertain what these truths are, and to exhibit their latent doctrines or general laws. This is not the only method open to the student of the Holy Scriptures; for Theology possesses the unspeakable advantage over Natural Science of being already aware of many of its highest generalizations before the act of induction, and the exponent of Dogmatics may consequently employ now the laborious method of arguing from a variety of particulars, and now the readier deductive process. Nevertheless, the science to which the name of Biblical Theology has been recently applied, is the result of the consistent application of the more tentative process. Exercising a cautious observation in marshalling the truths with which he has to deal, the Biblical Theologian summons to his aid, as far as is needful for his purpose, all the accessory means at his command, and makes diligent use of the auxiliary sciences of Biblical Criticism, Biblical Philology, and Biblical Psychology. Having to deal with a written record of an ancient time, he acquaints himself, as far as is necessary, with the original texts of the Old and New Testaments. Then, since the data with which he will be occupied are couched in foreign languages, a further subsidiary study directs itself to

[1] Dorner, *History of Protestant Theology* (T. & T. Clark), vol. ii. p. 433.

a sufficient knowledge of the lexicology and grammatical laws of Hebrew, Chaldee, and Hellenistic Greek. Nor is this textual and philological training all that is needful to enable him to proceed to his more special task. Since the Scriptures are written upon an unusual background of opinion, experience, and custom, he must also familiarize himself with their psychological standpoint,—sympathy being as indispensable for the appreciation of a sacred prophet as a profane poet. After a dutiful acquaintance has been made with these several preliminary aids, he may proceed to take the first step in biblical interpretation by assuring himself of the significance of isolated sentences. This gained, he may commence to generalize, and may advance stage by stage from the meaning of single precepts to that of paragraphs, thence to that of books, of combinations of books, of Testaments, and of the whole Bible. Biblical Theology is, in fact, a larger exegesis; it aims at the exact, organic, historical interpretation of the contents not of a verse or a chapter or a book, but of the entire Scripture.[1] A gigantic aim indeed! Ours is no such aim. We are but to deal with one narrow section of the larger science; but these introductory remarks will equally apply to the course we must pursue. We shall follow the path just delineated. By an assiduous employment of the several auxiliary studies we have mentioned, we shall exercise a becoming spirit of observation in eliciting those facts which bear upon the subject of Sacrifice. We shall then proceed to the labour of classification and induction, enunciating the several forms which the Doctrine of Sacrifice assumed during the course of sacred history. Our mark will subsequently be hit in the centre when we have obtained one organic whole, composed of different members it may be, yet displaying a fascinating and harmonious progress. If it be observed that the growth of opinion sketched above is not

[1] Compare on this subject of method, Oehler's pamphlet, *Prolegomena zur Theologie des Alt. Test.* 1845; Schleiermacher's famous essay, *Hermeneutik und Kritik;* Landerer's article, "Hermeneutik," in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie*, vol. v., and W. Schmidt's article in Herzog and Plitt, vol. vi.; Oehler's posthumous work, *Theologie des Alt. Test.* 1873, § 3 (translated in *Foreign Theological Library*, 1875). The author would also specially mention Diestel's *Geschichte des Alt. Test. in der christlichen Kirche*, 1869.

minutely mapped down in the several chapters of this treatise, the logician will remember that reasoning is still reasoning if it be stated in enthymemes.

On the subject of method, another point should be referred to. What has so often been said of the syllogistic method, holds equally of the inductive,—it is more frequently a criterion of truth than an organon of discovery. So the method we have just mapped down will aid us as much in testing truth as in discovering it. The man who sets himself to find out all things without extraneous aid, if he does not attempt the impossible, limits his attainments to the narrow circle of his personal knowledge and the narrow grasp of his individual intellect. The scientific inquirer does no such thing. His mind is a *tabula rasa* in this respect,—not that it is cleared of all the facts and inferences ascertained by others, but that it is prepared not to accept those facts and inferences until they have been accurately verified. He, for example, who has determined to ignore all the acquisitions of his predecessors and contemporaries, and to examine and classify the whole vegetable kingdom without assistance, is not a scientific botanist, but an Adamite; and he who, pursuing it may be some course of private investigation, accepts simply on authority the conclusions even of a Linnæus, a De Candolle, or a Lindley, is credulous without being scientific. The scientific botanist unflinchingly employs the inductive method as a means of discovery in the limited domain of his personal investigation, and also as a touchstone in the wide domain of the recorded investigations of others. To verify and never ignore the past history of his special study,—to accept not at sight, but after a patient assay,—is the part of the genuine searcher after truth. The same may be said in biblical study. He who is ignorant or arrogant enough to dream of interpreting by his unaided effort the whole Bible aright, is more worthy of ridicule, because of the greater difficulty of the subject-matter, than he who affects to build a science of the natural forces without consulting either the labours of physicists from the days of Anaximander and Archimedes to those of Grove and Tyndall, or that mass of acknowledged fact which is common property and forms the undisputed

contents of popular manuals. Undoubtedly the history of doctrine has largely, if tacitly, influenced the students of Biblical Theology; but if a statement of method is made at all, it ought to be complete, and so wide a source of knowledge should be distinctly noted. It is the duty of the Biblical Theologian not simply to interpret the contents of Scripture by a direct employment of the inductive method (which, as we have previously remarked, is to limit his researches by his own faculty of apprehension), but, having acquainted himself with the researches of others, accurately to try their conclusions by the same method, and accept or reject them accordingly. The labours of great exegetes, whether of the past or the present, have immense fertility of suggestion and correction; and the investigator of Scripture may learn as much from a cautious use of the interpretations of others as from his own researches. Indeed, he cannot be assured that his own interpretations are correct, unless he can demonstrate the unscriptural character of all others. The criticism of other opinions is the commentator's verification. Throughout this treatise it will be seen that the Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice is indirectly investigated by an examination of antagonistic theories, as well as directly by an exposition of Scripture.

The importance of such an inquiry as the present, is for several reasons very great. In the first place, it will facilitate an understanding of portions of the contents of that unique book, upon the comprehension of which, if regard be had, we will not say to its revealed, but simply to its philosophical character, it would assuredly be no waste of energy if the minds of our wisest and greatest were bent. Truth is ever valuable, but truth about the Bible is the religious need of our time. An indispensable preliminary to the satisfaction of that need is a scientific study of the book itself. The variety of professedly scriptural systems has thrown many upon the dilemma that either some of the sectarian interpretations must be incorrect, or that the Scriptures themselves, as is sometimes affirmed, may after all *mean anything*. The Bible must be consistent or inconsistent, and common sense has naturally drawn the inferences, that if it is consistent all

the several interpretations cannot be just, and that if it is inconsistent it does not deserve the high place as a religious guide usually accorded to it. It is true that of the reasoners who maintain that the lack of unanimity in interpretation argues the impossibility of agreement little notice need be taken; it might be as soundly alleged, that so long as there are opposing camps upon any disputed point, unanimity in the interpretation of nature is impossible. Just as Science fails as yet to interpret unanimously the whole realm of nature, so as yet Theology is unable to unanimously interpret the entire contents of Scripture. As Butler justly said: "It is not at all incredible that a book which has been so long in the possession of mankind should contain many truths as yet undiscovered; for all the phenomena and the same faculties of investigation from which such great discoveries in natural knowledge have been made in the present and the last age, were equally in the possession of mankind several thousand years before."[1] Nor should it be forgotten that biblical as well as natural interpretation has been enriched by pitched battles over rival hypotheses. The controversy upon Justification inaugurated a fervid study of the Bible long before the publication of *The Origin of Species* gave new life to Biology. Our knowledge of the Bible, like our knowledge of nature, consists of facts, inferences (facts of a wider application), and opinions, the relative domains of which are always being more accurately adjusted by the labours of successive explorers; and it is equally wrong to refuse to accept demonstrated facts and legitimate inferences as truth, and to denominate truth what has not yet passed the stage of opinion. In the attitude, however, of suspended judgment, with which the claims of the Bible are frequently met, it has become imperative that the consistency of the Scriptures should be conclusively vindicated or refuted. Hence we hold that, in the fever of modern research and the hesitancy of contemporary questioning, it is most important to attain a complete and impregnable knowledge of what the Bible actually contains. To show the possibility of a consistent interpretation of one difficult and perplexing portion of the Scriptures will

[1] *The Analogy of Religion*, Part II. cap. iii.

be one result of this treatise. The *continuity*[1] of Scripture is no mean argument for its veracity.

Then, secondly, the Doctrine of Sacrifice is the key to the understanding of Judaism. Not even the antiquary can afford to neglect the history and significance of the Israelitish nation. The children of Abraham, while consciously or unconsciously assimilating what they could from conquerors they despised, remained, in spite of the fascinations of the splendid tyranny of Egypt, the nomad life of the Arabian desert, the magnificent opulence of Babylon, the subtle æstheticism of Greece, and the compact military *régime* of Rome, "a peculiar people, distinct in habits and distinct in creed." Their state was a church; their judicial code was a religion; their lands were fiefs from the Most High; their magistrates were divine vicegerents; their priests were rulers, and their rulers priests; the republican phase of their polity, because of the headship of Jehovah, was indistinguishable from an absolute monarchy of the most rigid type; its monarchical phase displayed an extraordinary democracy, where kings were controlled by prophets from the ranks of the people. To the Christian, Judaism is of still higher importance. The children of Israel "are literally our spiritual ancestors; their imagery, their poetry, their very names have descended to us; their hopes, their prayers, their psalms are ours."[2] But there is another reason why any aid the most trifling should be earnestly welcomed to the study of Judaism. In the present unsettlement of religious belief, when every religion is standing upon its trial, and is judged by its individual merits rather than by its antiquity or the assertions of its votaries, considerable prominence is necessarily given to what is called the Science of Comparative Religion. Now, if Christianity is to make good its claim to superiority over Brahmanism, Buddhism, or the faith of Islam,—if the inspiration of the Bible is to be regarded as different in kind as well as degree from the *afflatus* which prompted the Vedas, the Koran, or the writings of Confucius, much of the stress of

[1] Comp. Oehler, *Theologie des Alt. Test.* § 7 (translated in *Foreign Theological Library*).

[2] Stanley, *The Eastern Church*, p. xxiv.

the demonstration will lie on the proof of the divine origin of the Christian faith and literature; thus the beginnings of both, as seen in the history of Israel, will possess an abnormal importance. Judaism is Christianity in embryo, and the contrast in doctrine and morals between the religion of Moses and the religions of all other ethnic competitors will have almost as much to do with the settlement of the question of the exceptional position of Christianity as the controversy concerning the Person of Christ. Now, if by the historian, the student of religions, and the professing Christian, the Jewish faith cannot be neglected without loss, neither can the Doctrine of Sacrifice, which forms so vital a portion of that faith. Indeed, whether it be true, as Bishop Temple has urged in his well-known essay, that "the results of the (divine) discipline of the Jewish nation may be summed up in two points, a settled national belief in the unity and spirituality of God, and an acknowledgment of the paramount importance of chastity as a point of morals,"[1] or whether it be a sufficient explanation of the purpose of the Hebrew race that "monotheism expresses and explains all the characteristics of the Semitic family,"[2] as M. Renan has alleged, will be more speedily settled by an investigation into the sacrificial ritual of the Tabernacle and the Temple than by any other means.

Thirdly, the Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice is of incalculable value in duly appreciating that cardinal tenet of Christianity, the doctrine of the Atonement. The truth of this statement can only be fully realized at the close of such a discussion as the present. Nevertheless, the slightest recollection, we will not say of New Testament language, but of common religious phraseology, will convince of the necessity of precise conceptions of the sacrificial teaching of the Old and New Testaments. It has been too much the habit of theologians to approach the study of the Levitical worship after exact views have already been gained of Christian teaching; a wiser procedure, inasmuch as the Law was divinely ordained to precede the Gospel, would be to make

[1] *Essays and Reviews*, "The Education of the Human Race."
[2] *Histoire Générale des Langues Sémitiques*, Book I. cap. i. sec. 1.

a preliminary investigation of Judaism. Instead of the vicious custom of reading the New Testament into the Old, would it not be a beneficial change if we were to begin to read the Old Testament into the New? Only too true are the words of a modern writer: "The death of Christ," in current estimation, "is not a sacrifice in the Levitical sense; but what we mean by the word sacrifice is the death of Christ."[1] The doctrine of Atonement will be seen in a flood of superadded light, if it is approached, as the Bible teaches us to do, from the side of the Mosaic sacrifices. Well might the learned Godwyn say, that the reason why "many have no better acquaintance with Christ and His apostles, is because they are such strangers with Moses and Aaron."[2] But leaving these general considerations to be subsequently substantiated, suffice it to add, that when so influential a system as the Arminian grounded its theory of the Atonement upon an inadequate view of the nature of scriptural sacrifice, it must be apparent to all how indispensable accurate views upon such a subject become.

And it may be urged, in the fourth place, that accurate views of the scriptural teaching concerning the ritual and nature of Sacrifice cannot but play an important part in combating that sacerdotal theory, of which the Church of Rome is the most consistent exponent, and which, more or less current since the third century of our era, has unexpectedly been brought into prominence of late by a section of the Anglican Church. Now it is no part of our labours to speak either rhetorically or critically concerning this theory, but we cannot refrain from saying that it is becoming daily one of the most burning ecclesiastical and theological questions. May the war be waged in the intellectual arena! and may it never be forgotten in the discussion that there is a soul of truth in things erroneous! We venture to assert that it is because so little has been heard of late in Protestant pulpits of the Christian doctrines of priesthood and sacrifice, that the Romish exaggerations of those truths have found a house ready swept and garnished for their reception.

[1] Jowett, *The Epistles of St. Paul*, vol. ii. p. 477.
[2] Godwyn, *Moses and Aaron*, dedication.

We have already drawn attention to the limits of our subject, by stating that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the source or the test of all opinions legitimate to our inquiry: our bounds will be still more accurately beaten by a definition of the word "Sacrifice." This is the more necessary, since the term as used in the Authorized Version and as now commonly employed is far from being unequivocal, and affords examples of both the tendencies of language to become either wider or more restricted in meaning, sometimes, for example, being equivalent to *sin-offering* (which is but a small portion of the biblical idea of sacrifice), and sometimes being expressive of movements of the religious life, such as inexpensive benevolence and unintentional self-denial (which the Scriptures would assuredly not designate by such a name). In our current theological literature also, we read of self-sacrifice and vicarious sacrifice, sacrifices that are types and those that are antitypes, symbolical sacrifice, and sacrifices without a trace of symbolism, a life that is a sacrifice and a death that is the same, a sacrifice offered once for all and sacrifices that may be daily offered, sacrifices that are acts of worship and sacrifices that are the undertaking of another's loss; and these expressions, it may be added, are either used without a suspicion that they contain anything requiring definition, or else without the slightest heed to biblical usage, until the reader cries out in the name of all that is precise at the subtle vagueness that is invading his thoughts. Manifestly, if we are to investigate the Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice, we must first ascertain and then rigidly adhere to the scriptural conception of sacrifice, and it may well be matter for congratulation that the scriptural conception was first expressed in the scrupulously nice language of Israel. From its possession of a store of appropriate generic and specific words with discriminate meanings, the Hebrew displays no such laxity in its use of sacrificial terms as we find either in English or Hellenistic Greek: its available terminology has the precision of science. If, then, we would transplant something of the same exactitude into our present investigation, the terminology we employ must be of sufficient accuracy to enable us to retain the Hebrew usage. Referring to the first Appendix

to this work for an examination of these Hebrew terms and their English and Greek equivalents, it may suffice for our immediate purpose to say that the necessary precision may be ensured by using the word *Sacrifice*, with its synonyms *oblation, offering, presentation*, in translating the Hebrew generic term, and adding differentiating words, as in *sin*-offering, *burnt* sacrifice, *evening* oblation, presentation of *meal*, to denote the several biblical species. A *Sacrifice*, then—the synonym of the Hebrew generic term—must be defined, in accordance with scriptural usage as well as etymology, as *a gift to God,—a surrender to Jehovah of what has cost the offerer something.* Negatively, it may be said that a sacrifice can never be costless, nor is that gift a sacrifice which is made to man. Such a definition must suffice for our present purpose, leaving it to the subsequent investigation to substantiate and qualify it.[1]

This introduction may now be concluded by explaining the division of the subject. This is an easy matter, for, according to the biblical conception, an act of sacrifice—the surrender of the life of the sinless Jesus upon Calvary—is at once the vanishing point of the Old Covenant and the starting-point of the New. The Bible thus restricts our examination, first, to that of the times of preparation, and secondly, to that of the times of fulfilment. But the preparatory epoch is a period of development through three principal stages—the Patriarchal, the Mosaic, and the Prophetic. The First Book of this treatise is therefore Preparatory, and treats of the Old Testament Doctrine of Sacrifice; this book naturally splitting itself into three divisions, the first of which deals with the doctrine in the days preceding the Mosaic legislation, the second with the doctrine as taught by Moses, and the third with the doctrine as developed during the post-Mosaic but pre-Christian age. The Second Book, called (from an expressive Greek word signifying *completion*) Pleromatic,[2] treats of the New Testament Doctrine of Sacrifice, and its reconciliation with the Doctrine of the Old Testament.

[1] On the contents of this paragraph, see Appendix I. on the Hebrew Sacrificial Terms, specific and generic, and their equivalents in English and Hellenistic Greek.

[2] Comp. Eph. i. 10 (Greek).

BOOK I.

PREPARATORY.

"Vetus Testamentum recte intelligentibus prophetia est Novi Testamenti."—
AUGUSTINE, *Contra Faustum Manichæum*, Book XV. cap. ii.

PART I.

THE PATRIARCHAL DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE.

"The Piety of the Patriarchal era was *individual*, not congregative,—it was domestic, not ecclesiastical,—it was genuine and affectionate, not formal or choral or liturgical,—it did not emulate or even desire the excitements of a throng of worshippers assembling 'to keep holy day,' and making the air ring with their acclamations; more of depth was there in that ancient piety; and it may be believed that the worshipper drew much nearer to the throne of the Majesty on high than did the promiscuous crowd that in after-times assembled to celebrate festivals and to observe national ordinances."—Isaac Taylor, *The Spirit of the Hebrew Poetry*, chap. vi. p. 112.

CHAPTER I.

THE ORIGIN OF SACRIFICE.

"Die Opfer des Alten Bundes sind freie Aeuszerungen der göttlich bestimmten Natur des Menschen."—NEUMANN, *Deutsche Zeitschrift für christl. Wissenschaft*, 1852, p. 238.

PECULIAR difficulties guard the approaches to the pre-Mosaic age; and not Eden itself is less accessible than that period of time to which the name of Antediluvian has been attached. "The mists that shroud antiquity" are sufficiently bewildering; but when, in addition to piercing them, we have to familiarize ourselves with habits and customs remote from present experience, whether European or Oriental; when we have to represent a life which, if we restrict ourselves to the biblical election of faith, feeble indeed in intellectual acquirements and social appliances, was at the same time millenarian in religious consciousness, the task may well seem insuperable. Who shall paint the portrait of an Enoch, for example, "walking with God" in the midst of an idolatrous generation, without written revelation, liturgy, or saintly companionship?—as manifest a contradiction to any theory of merely natural development as the expansion of water in the act of freezing is to the law of contraction on decrease of temperature. Further, in accordance with their habitual eclecticism, the scriptural records are so extremely sketchy and reticent, that single phrases, and even isolated words, possess an importance which it would be difficult to exaggerate. Age, an alien genius, and the paucity of details, prevent indisputable reasoning or accurate delineation.

We may at once, however, dismiss as unbiblical, and therefore irrelevant to our inquiry, a hypothesis favourably regarded in many quarters, that "the idea of sacrifices offered

up to immortal beings who govern the world presupposes a degree of culture and experience hardly acquired in the course of centuries;"[1] or, as the same truth has been otherwise expressed, that "sacrifices" are "a stage through which, in any natural process of development, religion must pass;"[2] or, again, that "the general study of the ethnography of religion, through all its immensity of range, seems to countenance the theory of evolution in its highest and widest sense."[3] Scripture does not countenance the theory of the evolution of sacrifice. It is the express teaching of the Book of Genesis, that offerings were, at any rate, made to God by the children of Adam and Eve, the first created pair. As, according to biblical teaching, the conclusions of Anthropology rest on the ultimate unity of the human race; as a biblical Cosmology must confess this present earth, with its attendant sun and planets, to be the result of a distinct creative act; as in a biblical Science of Religion the earliest faith must be represented as monotheistic, and the several forms of heathenism as aberrations from the primary faith, its wayward offspring and not its ignorant parents; so, in that religious history of mankind which professes to adhere to the scriptural archives, the offering of sacrifice must almost immediately follow the exit from Eden. With the truth or falsity of this statement, as we have remarked in our introduction, we are not concerned; it is enough to draw attention to the fact.

But a study of the opening chapters of Genesis compels us to find a still earlier date for the origin of sacrifice; for they imply that sacrifice, in the scriptural sense of that word, was synchronous with the creation of man. The whole life of our unfallen primogenitors was one continuous self-surrender. "For then," as Augustine says, "pure and untainted by any spot or blemish of sin, they gave their very selves to God as the cleanliest offerings."[4] That exceptional life of

[1] Kalisch, *Commentary on Leviticus*, "Preliminary Essay on the Sacrifices of the Hebrews," etc., § 2.

[2] Lubbock, *The Origin of Civilization*, p. 237; 3rd ed. p. 351.

[3] Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, vol. ii. p. 408.

[4] *De Civitate Dei*, Book XX. cap. xxvi.

fearless intercourse was itself an oblation of the saintliest and most expressive kind,—a kind, indeed, which it was the problem of all succeeding phases of sacrificial worship to restore. Whether the devotional feelings which possessed our first parents assumed any material form other than the obedient fulfilment of their allotted tasks of government and tillage, the conceptions formed of that paradisaic life must determine. It may possibly be true, as was said by one of the later Rabbis, that "before Adam sinned he was himself a sacrifice, and had on that account no need of further sacrifice; but after he had sinned and experienced the sense of need which naturally follows, he brought a sacrifice to remove that sense."[1] It will, however, weigh with most, that, altogether apart from the simplicity and artlessness which characterized the paradisaic relations between God and man, a self-sacrifice which did not include a sacrifice of substance would be unworthy and incomplete. To give labour was surely to give its fruits. As the details, therefore, of that primeval life slowly harmonize in the mind, one is almost irresistibly led to echo the words of Sartorius: "I doubt not that our first parents in Paradise, invested with sway over the earth, brought not simply prayers, but, out of the thankfulness of their hearts, sacrifices of praise and thanks, by consecrating to God the firstlings of the flowers and fruits of Eden."[2] But without spending words upon what words will never decide, let it be remembered, first, that all the sacrifices in Eden were eucharistic—expressive, that is, of those inseparable feelings of cheerful dependence and gratitude; and, secondly, that they consisted in all probability not simply of the ceaseless acts of a ready obedience, but of such material expressions of devotion as fruit and corn. Immediately, however, the sword barred the entrance to the garden, this paradisaic sacrifice was at an end, and as yet man knew no other.

The interval of interrupted sacrifice was not prolonged.

[1] Rabbi Jacob, quoted by Tholuck, *Das Alte Test. im Neuen Test.* Part II. § 1; p. 81 in 6th edition.

[2] Sartorius, *Ueber den Alt. und Neutest. Cultus*, p. 52. Comp. Kliefoth, *Liturgische Abhandlungen*, vol. iv. p. 8.

After a lapse of years—so the history runs—sufficient for the birth of Eve's two eldest children, their growth to years of responsibility, and their engagement in the crafts of the stock-keeper and agriculturist, Cain and Abel brought offerings to the Lord: "And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering[1] to the Lord. And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock, and indeed of their fat."[2] Whether the brothers had ever brought offerings before, we are not told.[3] Cain may have presented his fruits and Abel his lambs, as their father had in all probability done in Eden, *unheard* or at least *unanswered*; but the divine recognition on the present occasion of Abel's offering renders certain that Abel had never sacrificed in

[1] Gen. iv. 3–5. Considerable difficulty has been seen in the fact that Abel's sacrifice is designated *minchah*,—a word which is used in Leviticus for vegetable offerings exclusively. Is not the explanation simpler than has been supposed? Referring to Old Testament usage, we find the word in question used with a variety of applications. In Leviticus, it is true, it stands for such things as corn and cakes; but elsewhere it is differently employed, sometimes being contrasted with burnt-offerings, more frequently in contrast with blood-sacrifices, whilst in some passages it signifies any offerings whatever, whether animal or vegetable, and is even used for the morning and evening sacrifice. This statement of various usage would not be complete if we did not add that in numerous instances the word, even in the Pentateuch, has no reference to sacrifice at all, but simply signifies a present from man to man. The fundamental idea of the word is, a sacrifice where the *act of presentation*, not that of *burning* or *slaughter*, is the prominent feature. Thus, in the present passage, Abel's offering is appropriately named *minchah*, because it is the fact of presentation at all that is emphasized. Further, the distinction between a bloodless and a blood-sacrifice belongs to the Mosaic Age, and not to earlier times. See Appendix I.

[2] It is but the exigencies of his peculiar interpretation which has led Keil, *Commentar über Genesis, in loco* (Keil and Delitzsch on *the Pentateuch*, *Foreign Theological Library*, vol. i. p. 109), to translate "of their fat"—"of the fattest of the firstlings." There is no biblical authority for such an interpretation. Indeed, the very Hebrew word employed points to "the fatty portions" of the carcase so frequently mentioned in the Levitical law (see Lev. viii. 26, ix. 19, etc.). Such an interpretation is as unwarranted as that of Grotius, who considered these "fatty portions" to be *wool* and *milk*.

[3] Very opposite arguments have been deduced from the form of the narrative. Magee, *Discourses and Dissertations on Atonement and Sacrifice*, Dissert. lxiv., thinks the opening words, "in process of time," signify a stated time for the performance of that duty which Abel fulfilled, and that "the whole turn of phrase marks a previous and familiar observance." Warburton, *Divine Legation of Moses*, Book IX. cap. ii., finds in the same words conclusive proof not only that this was the first sacrifice, but that this sacrifice was of human origination.

exactly the same way before: "And the Lord looked upon Abel and his offering; but upon Cain and his offering He did not look."[1] Into this incident of the first accepted sacrifice of fallen man we must closely examine, and, "by comparing and pursuing intimations scattered up and down it, which are overlooked and disregarded by the generality of the world,"[2] understand what we can.

At the outset, let us premise that it is of the utmost moment, in the study of these primitive times, not to overstep the limits of what is written. We have, for example, no solution offered here as to whether the divine approval was conveyed by a visible sign, such as a flame or a flash of lightning,[3] or by a subjective experience, unquestionable and personal, analogous to that which the Christian possesses in the assurance of faith; and far more weighty problems are suggested by this narrative than this of archæological memory. Studied by the more circumstantial knowledge of later times, there are numerous doctrinal questions which this episode suggests, the answers to which can never transcend the barest possibility. Let us not make the mistake of finding in the suggestiveness of birth all the minutiæ of ultimate growth. If we will but restrict ourselves to the exact statements of the narrative and their legitimate implications, features will be discovered in this general and undifferentiated rite of considerable moment.

Two questions rise for settlement: first, What was the

[1] The Septuagint has the very singular reading (to which Origen called attention in his *Eclogæ*) of θυσία for Cain's sacrifice, and δῶρον for Abel's, thus reversing the common usage, as many have supposed. Is not such a fact conclusive proof that both words were considered by the Seventy as synonymous? See Appendix I.

[2] Butler, *The Analogy of Religion*, Part II. cap. iii.

[3] Scriptural analogy would, it must be admitted, lead us to infer that this recognition was by fire. By fire the divine approval was manifested to Gideon, and at the inauguration of the Tabernacle and the Temple (see Lev. ix. 24; Judg. vi. 21; 2 Chron. vii. 1). And so it has frequently been decided (comp. Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, 2nd ed. 2nd half, 1st div. p. 220, and *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, vol. i. p. 33; Delitzsch, *Commentar über Genesis*, vol. i. p. 195). Fairbairn, *The Typology of Scripture* (T. & T. Clark), 5th ed. vol. i. p. 288, thinks that the seal of acceptance was conveyed by some movement of the cherubim or the flaming sword, near which he imagines the service would naturally be performed.

nature of Abel's sacrifice? and, secondly, What was its origin? In other words, What were the feelings which impelled Abel to offer sacrifice in the form he did? and, How came he to choose that special form?

What, then, was the nature of Abel's sacrifice? Was a gift of lambs essentially superior to a gift of fruits? Was it that Abel's sacrifice was a thankoffering, and Cain's a thankless presentation? Was the quality determined by the fact that the offerings of Abel were choice, and those of Cain indiscriminate? Had the effusion of blood, which must have taken place before Abel could present the fat of his victims, anything to do with the acceptability of the offering? Was the death of the animal any recognition on Abel's part of his mortal desert, and the sin of Cain an insufficient contrition for his faults? All these queries have received affirmative answers at the hands of commentators. We do not undertake to examine these replies in detail. The best reply will be given by as minute an analysis of Abel's act as the circumstances of the case allow. Four motives must have impelled Abel to that deed which earned for him the cognomen of "righteous,"—a sense of divine estrangement, a desire to approach the Deity, a trust in the merciful features of the divine proclamation to sinful man sufficient to countenance approach, and a consciousness of the penal clauses of that proclamation of sufficient intensity to severely condition that approach. Abel knew no more of the Divine Being than had been previously revealed in the Creation, Paradise, and the Fall; yet these revelations were adequate to inform him of the broad principles of religion. In the divine declaration to the newly-created Adam, in the bliss of Eden, in the flame "cutting hither and thither" without the gate, in the severe toil and heated brow, in that sentence so inappropriately called "the curse," in all the memories and experiences of that primeval life, our first ancestors knew of One, the Creator and Preserver of the world and man, Who, by sumptuous sustenance, by pleasant toil, by delegated rule, by congenial companionship human and divine, had provided for their happiness in their sinless days; Who had been grossly discredited and wilfully disobeyed; Who had sternly upheld by

punishment His violated decree; Who, in the announcement of doom, had held an even balance, eternally cursing the tempter, whilst simply punishing the tempted, and in the administration of justice had attempered severity with mercy, not sentencing the fallen to fruitless toil, to endless ascendency of the flesh, or to immediate disintegration; Who, compassionating the distress of our first parents when, in the naïve words of Scripture, they "knew that they were naked," had humbled Himself to make coats of skins to cover them. With such a spiritual education there must have been a terrific conflict of emotions in Abel's mind before his ultimate decision to approach the Divine Majesty. "Could approach," he would assuredly argue, "be acceptable to Him who, because His loving condescension had been repaid by disobedience, had withdrawn Himself within His secret pavilion? Was the longing after God any pledge that God longed after him? Would not approach be intrusion, and intrusion be punished by the immediate fulfilment of that sentence so mysteriously described as 'death'?" Enough that the knowledge which Abel possessed of God gave the victory to a trust in the divine mercy, and that, neither despairing nor presuming, he determined to make trial of the divine attitude towards himself. Taking the firstlings of his flock, he killed them, and presented them and their fat before the Lord.

Now no one, it may be assumed, who has in the least degree entered into the spirit of these early records, so advanced in their conception of the Deity, and so pure in their religious teaching, will maintain for a moment that these slaughtered animals were other than symbolical. To the notion that these sacrifices were presented with the design of appeasing in some heathen anthropomorphic fashion a terrible Being who had sway over nature and man, the whole narrative gives the lie. But of what were they symbolical? Does this presentation of lambs substantiate our previous analysis of Abel's motives? What did the act of sacrifice in any form symbolize? and what is the significance of sacrifice in this extraordinary form?

One feature of Abel's act is abundantly clear. His offering was eucharistic. Indeed, it would appear from the fact that

both brothers brought their gifts at the same time, that they were following some precedent,—possibly, as we have before hinted, the eucharistic offerings of Paradise. For Abel to offer the lambs which his incessant care had reared was to offer part of his very self; and every such offering must be eloquent of self-surrender. Now presentation of anything was an embodiment of two of the feelings which must have agitated Abel,—viz., his desire to approach the Most High, and his conviction of the divine mercy. But were this desire and willingness to serve the Lord, thus emblematically expressed by a gift of the produce of toil, all that the symbol contained? The mere approach itself would be sufficient proof of the desire to draw near to his Maker; gratitude for life given or spared, any feeling of worshipful surrender that happened to be the predominant motive of approach, would be represented by any offering of the products of labour; the intensity of worshipful feeling would be conveyed by the careful choice of firstlings and the presentation of their fat;—But why were the offerings not merely selected, but *slaughtered?* If Abel simply wished to express his gratitude for life and its blessings, what appropriateness could there be in symbolizing gratitude for life by death? If his intention was to objectify thankfulness for mercies, how came it that he imagined that his enjoyment would be symbolized by the removal of all possibility of enjoyment from an animal? The nature of the symbol employed, as well as the preceding history of the Fall, compels us to look farther than a sense of grateful surrender for the significance of Abel's act. The eucharistic theory of the Origin of Sacrifice, whilst it acknowledges the two indispensable postulates of the divine mercy and human desire for worship, most disastrously neglects the equally indispensable postulates of human sin and divine alienation. That Abel slaughtered his lambs is proof positive of his conviction that for him the eucharistic offerings of Eden were no more. His was a novel means of sacrifice, and the very novelty testifies to Abel's sense of inability to approach the Deity in the simple and entire consecration of his parents before the Fall. To his desire to worship, and to his faith in the divine mercy, the very form which the sacrifice of these lambs assumed is

an impregnable argument that Abel superadded a sense of divine estrangement, and a consciousness of the penal clauses of the curse.

The justness of this conclusion concerning the symbolical nature of Abel's sacrifice will more clearly appear upon a consideration of the second question proposed: "How came Abel to select the especial form he did? How was it that the extraordinary notion entered Abel's head of killing his lambs and giving them to God apparently valueless?" The answer to this question will afford the most convincing exhibition of the actual state of Abel's mind, and substantiate the peculiar significance of this earliest sacrifice of slain animals which we have already deduced.

It is idle to import into the discussion statements which were made in after times concerning the power of "blood" to effect atonement, or to say that Abel thus displayed a knowledge of the potency of the finished work of Christ, or to assert that he was but fulfilling some express commandment given from above; all such statements are unwarranted by the record itself. What we have in all sobriety to do is to answer from the data before us, or to declare unanswerable, why Abel presented before the Lord sacrifices which the mention of fat declares to have been slaughtered. Now, be it recalled to mind that the first experience given to Adam, after his participation in Eve's sin, of a change in the relations between himself and his Maker, was a sense of shame arising from a recognition of nakedness, and that the first act of divine mercy was, in the suggestive words of Scripture, "to make coats of skins and clothe them." This clothing was an exquisitely sacramental act, which must have wrought with ever-deepening conviction the feeling of forgiveness. Have we not here the clue of which we are in search? Again the sense of sin and terrible estrangement was enwrapping a human soul, and in a moment of divine enlightenment the thought had come that the death of an animal might once more bring relief. Possibly God would again "clothe" him, or grant that quietude which was a consequence of the covering of nakedness.[1] Surely it

[1] "Surely it is not attributing to the venerable heads of the human family, persons who had so recently walked with God in Paradise, an incredible power

was in some such course of reasoning that Abel's faith consisted. The Lord God merciful and gracious had sent a gleam of light into the darkness that had fallen upon the world. Abel lived up to that light; he made trial of it upon new issues, and, deeply conscious of sin and estrangement, yearning for forgiveness, he advanced from an instinctive feeling of the appropriateness of the finest fruits of his calling to symbolize the grateful surrender of himself to Him "in whom he lived and moved and had his being," to the less self-evident belief that these lambs, if slaughtered, might be divinely accepted, and become to him instruments of hope and pardon. Abel "did good" in making his offering both an expression of penitence and gratitude, "those inseparable religious emotions," and at the same time a prayer of faith for forgiveness and assurance. He did as his Maker had done before him, and, laying the creatures he had slain according to precedent before the Lord, besought that the previous consequence might again follow. The lifting up of the divine countenance upon the offering proved conclusively the soundness of Abel's prepossessions. The "look" of the Lord demonstrated that man might approach the Divine Majesty by means of acceptable sacrifice; and that acceptable sacrifice consisted, objectively, of an offering which followed at once the precedent of Eden and the precedent divinely established, and, subjectively, of that pious frame of mind which lived in the experience of those religious facts which had been revealed by God to man. A gift of the choicest and best was not enough, nor was the feeling of worship enough which such a gift might express; a slaughtered animal was not enough, nor was the trustful

of spiritual discernment, or supposing them to stretch unduly the spiritual import of this particular action of God, if we should conceive them turning the divine act into a ground of obligation and privilege for themselves, and saying: 'Here is Heaven's own finger pointing out the way for obtaining relief for our guilty consciences. The covering of our shame is to be found by means of the skins of irrational creatures, slain in our behalf—*their* lives for *our* lives, *their* clothing of innocence for *our* shame; and we cannot err—we shall but show our faith in the mercy and forgiveness we have experienced—if, as often as the sense of shame and guilt returns, we follow the footsteps of the Lord, and by a renewed sacrifice of life clothe ourselves anew with His own appointed badge of acquittal and acceptance.'" What Fairbairn, *Typology*, vol. i. p. 298, thus ascribes to Adam, is ascribed in the text to Abel.

following of the divine precedent which such a slaughtering conveyed: acceptable sacrifice must display all these things in harmonious union.[1]

If these inferences are warranted, the sin of Cain consisted in the fact that, although from the force of custom or a momentary impulse he desired to approach God in sacrifice, he neither recognised the means which the divine clemency had ordained to allay the sense of guilt, nor even possessed, as the form of his sacrifice shows, any feeling of estrangement or fear of the divine anger such as moved his brother. For Cain, the world of thorns and thistles was still Eden. It is noteworthy, also, that it is not even said that he brought of the choicest or the earliest of his agricultural produce to lay before the Lord, —an early example of the proverb, "He who knows no sin knows no gratitude." Nor is it any alleviating circumstance, as some maintain, that each brother simply brought of the products of his special avocation; for barter was possible, or else the very incentive to a division of labour is eschewed. Mentally, the offering of Cain was characterized neither by a sense of sinfulness and its invariable effects, nor by adequate gratitude; materially, his offering was presumptuous and unprecedented for a sinful man.

A reply may now be readily returned to that question which has engaged so much attention at different times,—whether the origin of animal sacrifice was divine or human.[2] Some

[1] Without forestalling subsequent investigation, it is well to remind the reader that one element which must be taken into account in estimating any theory of the origin of Blood-sacrifice must be the congruity of that theory with later scriptural teaching. Now the theory just advanced, which finds the origin of Abel's sacrifice in his perception of the importance of the precedent established in the divine act of clothing, explains an otherwise inexplicable feature of the Mosaic ritual,—viz. the figure of speech employed in the Hebrew to designate what the Authorized Version translates as "atonement."

[2] For an able *résumé* of this famous controversy, see Outram, *De Sacrificiis*, 1st ed. 1677, Book I. cap. i., who, himself refraining from affirming anything as certain, cites Chrysostom, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Theodoret, Cyril of Alexandria, Maimonides, Eusebius of Cæsarea, and Rabbis Ben Gerson and Abarbanel for the human side. Amongst later writers, Warburton, *Divine Legation*, Book IX. cap. ii.; and Davison, *Inquiry into the Origin and Intent of Sacrifice*, pp. 19, 20, and *Discourses on Prophecy*, 6th ed. p. 67, declare themselves for the human origin. Whilst Faber, *Horæ Mosaicæ*, vol. ii. p. 239; Magee, *Discourses on the Atonement*, etc., Discourse II. and Disserts. xlvii.,

have maintained that Abel sacrificed in obedience to an express divine command; others, in obedience to a tentative impulse. The details of the narrative seem to point to a *via media*. The paradisaic sacrifices, it is true, were the spontaneous devotional acts of a right-minded worshipper: to know God and not know sin, was to give oneself unreservedly to holy service. But with respect to the offerings of fallen man, the case is different. The precedent which Abel constituted into a precedent for animal sacrifice was undoubtedly of divine appointment; just as certainly the stretch of faith, the spiritual vision, so conspicuous in Abel, was human. The vague leadings, the data for decision, were of God; the reachings forth of faith, the deliberate act, were of man. Besides, to say that this earliest animal sacrifice was dictated by a religious impulse in the human mind,—that impulse itself being divinely prompted,—would harmonize with the whole patriarchal and scriptural annals of the divine interference in human affairs, as well as with the primeval promise at the Fall of mingled struggle and salvation.[1]

Abel paid for his pioneership with his blood. But unintentionally he had done in some degree what his great Antitype did wholly and consciously: he had given his life a ransom for many. Thenceforth (we are simply dealing with the biblical statements) it became truth for man, that the interruption of intercourse between the Creator and His creature necessitated by the Fall had been momentarily annulled. Thenceforth a kind of gospel proclaimed itself, that, in some unexplained way, the awful consequences of "Eve's first disobedience" had been palliated. With equal clearness, from the time of the rejection of the offering of Cain, it had become evident that not every sacrifice would be efficacious, but only those would ensure the divine regard which accurately fulfilled certain conditions. From the death of Abel, in fact, a divine revelation had become the hereditary possession of the human

xlviii.; Pye Smith, *Four Discourses*, Discourse I.; and Litton, *Mosaic Dispensation*, p. 95, declare themselves for the divine origin.

[1] Comp. Bushnell, *The Vicarious Sacrifice*, p. 386; Keil, *Handbuch der biblischen Archäologie*, vol. i. p. 192; Neumann, *Deutsche Zeitschrift zur christliche Wissenschaft*, 1852, p. 238; and Oehler, "Opfercultus des Alten Testaments," Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie*, vol. x. p. 617.

race, that the Almighty, although estranged by the Fall, could be approached in animal sacrifice.

Accepting, then, for the sake of argument, the truth of the recital just studied, would there have been anything extravagant in its prominence, or would it be incredible that sacrifice of animal victims should have played so large a part in the lives of those religious heroes of the Patriarchal Age selected for immortal fame? Would it even be incredible, always on the assumption of the unity of the human family, that in after times this rite should have become a world-wide institution, albeit oftentimes observed with the spirit of Cain, in times and places where all signs of its origin or true nature had long been buried or falsified? Confining ourselves, however, to the statements of Genesis, it is evident that wherever in later times there was a desire on the part of the patriarchs to approach God in any form of worship, this primitive sacrifice suggested the medium to which recourse was had. When the waters of the Deluge had assuaged, "Noah built an altar unto the Lord; and took of every clean beast, and every clean fowl, and offered burnt-offerings upon the altar."[1] Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob assured themselves on their migrations of the abiding presence of the Lord, by the erection of altars at the several places to which they came or returned.[2] By animal sacrifice Jacob took God to witness between himself and Laban.[3] Nor must the reiterated divine command for such acts be left out of sight.[4] It is also a fair inference from the common erection of altars,[5] that there was a more frequent sacrificial observance than has been specifically described. The very question of Isaac, "Where is the lamb for the burnt-offering?"[6] testifies to the lad's familiarity with the rite.

[1] Gen. viii. 20.
[2] Gen. xii. 7, 8, xiii. 4, xxvi. 25, xxxiii. 20, xlvi. 1.
[3] Gen. xxxi. 54.
[4] Gen. xxii. 2, xxxv. 1.
[5] Gen. xxviii. 18, xlvi. 1.
[6] Gen. xxii. 7.

CHAPTER II.

THE DEVELOPMENT AND SIGNIFICANCE OF PATRIARCHAL SACRIFICE.

"Den Menschen in seinem geistigen Bilden und Gestalten zu rechtfertigen ist ein edles Geschäft."—HEGEL, *Æsthetik*, i. p. 401.

HOWEVER originated, once fairly rooted in the thought and practice of a single mind,—and rooted it must have been from the circumstance of the divine approval,—the elementary principle of approach to God by means of animal sacrifice, in accordance with the analogy of the Scripture revelations generally, was permitted to grow by common processes into the popular consciousness. No more distinct reply was given for ages to the religious cravings of humanity. Even the intimations made to Noah and Abraham were simply hortatory or corrective; they encouraged the ordinance, or explained its limits, without further explaining its nature. Throughout the Patriarchal Age, the spiritual discovery of Abel became the warrant and the model of all religious worship.

Left thus to themselves, the patriarchs extracted what heavenly consolation they could from their great precedent, and, still retaining the fundamental features, enlarged its application and augmented its symbolism. Sacrifice entered upon a stage of natural development. What had brought relief at one critical moment, was employed for religious purposes at all times and all seasons. The Lord had given a fact. Abel, with characteristic faith, had brought a fervid meditation to bear till the divine fact became a motive for deliberate action; his descendants displayed their religious spirit by carrying their ancestor's example into all the varied relations of life. A solitary rite became a universal cultus.

The development which the original act underwent in the

pre-Mosaic Age, showed itself on the subjective side by the numerous religious feelings it was made to express. In the rush of emotion which urged Abel to his deed, two feelings were uppermost,—the desire for worship, and the desire for forgiveness. In after-times, the strong crying and tears being forgotten, the fact of the divine acceptance alone remained. That approach to God was possible at all, became emphasized; and entrance to the Holiest once effected, the avenue was trodden, not for one purpose only, but for many. Indeed, it is difficult to define what were the feelings which actuated the worshippers even on the occasions recorded in Genesis when offerings were presented; but it is clear enough that whenever approach was desired to the heavenly throne, animal blood was spilt. The offerings presented by Noah and his descendants conclusively demonstrate the variety of occasions on which this method of divine worship was resorted to. All those subtle emotions which subsequently found expression in burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, in sin-offerings and trespass-offerings, in incense and tithes,—nay, all those subtle emotions which constitute the spiritual feeling of mankind the wide world over, were brought to the Lord and presented with the accompaniment of the bodies of clean beasts.

But it is in the objective side of sacrifice that the development which resulted from the patriarchal sentiment is most fully seen. There was quite a variety of detail added to the ritual by the operation of the common processes of thought. So early as the time of Noah, advances had been made upon the method of Abel. Whereas Abel signified his sense of indebtedness by an oblation of lambs, and knew no higher ritual than simple slaughter and subsequent devout presentation, Noah gave expression to his gratitude by an offering of every clean beast and bird, pursuing in addition a more elaborate plan in the details of the gift. Having erected an altar, he not merely slaughtered his victims, but consumed them by fire. Whether these features of ritual were originated before the days of Noah it is impossible to tell, but the universality they afterwards attained is explained by their singular propriety. Altars—earth *raised* to heaven—were the steeples of patriarchal times; they embodied the thought

of the Psalmist when he sang, "The heavens are Thy throne." As to the greater number and variety of the victims, that followed from the very nature of sacrifice; the more costly the gift, the truer the sacrifice. Further, to consume the victim by fire,—to cause the smoke of the burning sacrifice to rise towards heaven,—if it was not due to some tradition that it was by fire the divine approval was signified to Abel, is at once seen to be a more symbolically complete presentation. Nor did the evolution of the material side of sacrifice end in these additional elements so frequently seen in post-Noachian sacrifice. In a sacrifice subsequently made by Jacob,[1] we even find that the whole of the carcase of the offering was not consumed, but—a curious anticipation of later prescriptions—part was presented to God as a kind of patriarchal "grace before meat," and part was retained to form a sacrificial feast. Other innovations were also made. That there should be fixed recurring times of sacrificial observance, would perhaps be contrary to the spirit of that age of scanty religious privileges.[2] When the knowledge of God was in its most elementary form, when neither Law, Prophets, nor Gospel had spoken, when there were consequently no dogmas settled by the general consent of a Church, when there was not even a Church, the piety of good men would consist, not in subtle analyses of feeling periodically exhibited, nor in intellectual apprehension of doctrine periodically explained, but in a faith simple, exemplary, incessant. Sabbatarianism is ecclesiastical. But whether traces of such recurrence can be found or not, the growth is apparent of a rudimentary idea of the appropriateness of special places of worship, as is seen in the frequent erection of altars, now in

[1] Gen. xxxi. 54, xlviii. This variety of sacrifice is designated *tsevach*—not *peace-offering*, the technical name of which is *shelamim*, but *festal-offering*, the genus of which the peace-offerings are species. See Appendix I.

[2] "Oblations were not yet indeed fixed unto times and seasons, as the most of them, especially the most solemn, was afterwards under the Law; and therefore I suppose their offering was occasional; upon some appearance of God to them, on great mercies received, in times of great dangers, troubles, or perils to themselves and families, when they were in doubts and perplexities about their affairs, and would inquire of God for direction, they betook themselves unto this solemn service, as the instances on record do manifest."—Owen, *Exposition of the Hebrews*, Exercitatio I. on Priesthood of Christ.

places where the Deity had already manifested Himself,[1] and now in the consecration of a new home.[2] There are also traces of the gradual rise of a separate order of sacrificial ministrants, chosen either because of exemplary piety or social pre-eminence; sacrifices being performed by the heads of families on behalf of their respective households,[3] and at length by the princes of those larger families, the petty patriarchal kingdoms.[4]

To obviate, however, an especial danger to which the cardinal principle was liable, a second revelation was made during this age, ratifying and defining the first. It has been already seen that the fact had been committed to the reverent keeping of tradition, that Abel, by the selection and slaughter of the fittest, had obtained an assurance of his restoration to divine favour — what, then, would be more natural than that human victims, the value of the material side of sacrifice being exaggerated, should be considered more reverend and potent than animal? If Abel had attracted the divine regard by the slaughter of domestic creatures of pure form and superior parts, would not the offended Deity be better pleased with that self-surrender which would be instanced by the voluntary slaughter of the nearest and dearest? At any rate, we have the wide teaching of history,[5] that from the days when children were passed through the fires of "horrid" Moloch, and Achilles threw upon the funeral pyre of Patroclus

"A dozen noble sons of haughty Troy,"

to the more recent times, when multitudes immolated themselves beneath the wheels of Juggernaut, or were ruthlessly massacred in commemoration of the "grand customs" of the deceased kings of Dahomey, in nations barbaric and in those of considerable pretensions to culture and civilization alike, men have so reasoned. Such a deduction was effectively precluded wherever the trial of the faith of Abram[6] was known.

[1] Gen. xii. 7, xxxv. 14. [2] Gen. xiii. 18.
[3] Gen. viii. 20, xii. 7, xiii. 18, xxvi. 25, xxxiii. 20, xxxv. 3; Job i. 5.
[4] Gen. xiv. 18; Ex. ii. 16, iii. 1.
[5] See the able historical review of human sacrificing in Kalisch, *Leviticus*. Essay A. § 21.
[6] Gen. xxii. 11–14.

Having been bidden offer up his son, the offspring of his age and the pledge of his posterity, as a holocaust on Mount Moriah, when, in single-eyed obedience, the victim was bound and the knife drawn, Abram's hand was stayed by the voice of an angel, the effusion of blood being completed by the substitution of a ram. In this act we have, in the first place, a renewed sanction of animal sacrifice as a method of approach to God; in the second place, a renewed declaration that an objective sacrifice must have its subjective side of penitent and voluntary surrender, so entire, indeed, as not to withhold on demand the life of an only son, born under privileged conditions and with a privileged destiny; and, in the third place, together with a distinct approval of the motives which prompted human sacrifice, a distinct disapproval of such sacrifice. What a hold this incident and its lessons had upon Abraham's descendants, the whole subsequent history of the chosen seed testifies.

Having thus broadly indicated the features of patriarchal sacrifice as determined by divine revelation and human adoration, one or two questions intimately connected with this earliest phase of the entire scriptural doctrine may be considered. These questions concern the relation of these offerings to the religious life of the time. And first we have to consider the relation of patriarchal sacrifice to the forgiveness of sins.

To maintain that there was any such relation is to deny a very commonly expressed opinion that there is no example of expiatory sacrifice in pre-Mosaic times. Now it would be extraordinary indeed, if, when the consequences of sin were so tangible, the sacrifice of Abel, for example, had no reference whatever to conscious sinfulness. However such an opinion[1] can have got a footing in theological circles at all is a puzzle, unless it be that the mere mention of that distracting word "expiatory" (of which we shall have something to say

[1] See Kalisch, *Leviticus*, Essay A. § 3; Dale, *Jewish Temple and Christian Church*, p. 283; Hengstenberg, *Die Opfer der heiligen Schrift*, p. 14 (*Commentary on Ecclesiastes*, T. & T. Clark, p. 377); Bähr, *Symbolik des mosaischen Cultus*, vol. ii. p. 363; Kurtz, *Der Alttestamentliche Opfercultus*, § 87; Oehler, in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie*, vol. x. p. 618, and *Theologie des Alt. Test.* vol. i. § 121 (translated in *Foreign Theological Library*); Keil,

hereafter) is sufficient to introduce irreparable confusion into thought. Or perhaps this view, so unwarranted by the facts, is a logical consequence of the prevalent adaptation of the earlier books of Scripture to the darling evolution theory of the hour. Now, if it be meant that in primitive times there is no account of an offering which by its intrinsic merit, apart from any reference either to a present accommodation or a future achievement, wrought the forgiveness of sins, this is undoubtedly true; but then it is also true, that in such a sense no Old Testament sacrifice could be designated expiatory. Or, if it be meant that in patriarchal times there were no sacrifices which expressed the single idea of an offering for sin without the interblending of other ideas, this is also true; but then, on the other hand, it must not be overlooked that before the Mosaic institutions, in the days of undeveloped religious observances, there were no sacrifices which were exclusively thank-offerings, or peace-offerings, or trespass-offerings. But if it be meant that during the Patriarchal Age there were no sacrifices which had even a partial reference to human sin, this, however much may be attributed *dem kindlichen charakter* of those times, must on the face of the evidence be most emphatically denied. Indeed, it would be contrary to that divine arrangement by which the initiation of any movement is characterized,—namely, that it should originate in an instinctive, if not intellectual clearness of vision seldom afterwards experienced,—were not the offerings of Abel and his imitators in every pre-Christian sense expiatory. Or, leaving so general a consideration, how shall we satisfactorily explain the distinction between the adoration of the two brothers, or the ritual of every subsequent sacrifice, which, as we have previously argued, slaughtered as well as presented its choice gifts, if they had not some reference to the alleviation of that mortal curse primarily pronounced upon the defalcation in Paradise? That in some way animal

Archäologie, vol. i. p. 194. Although he refuses to follow Lightfoot and Magee in their unauthorized translation of Gen. iv. 7, "a sin-offering lieth at the door," the author, in common with Fairbairn, *Typology*, vol. i. p. 302, Delitzsch, *Die Genesis Ausgelegt, in loco*, and Schöberlein, article "Versöhnung," in Herzog, vol. xvii. p. 88, endorses their opinion as to the existence of expiatory sacrifices whilst rejecting their arguments.

sacrifice and forgiveness of sins were cause and effect, the history of Cain and Abel demonstrates.

But, granting the matter of fact, what was there in the "sweet savour" from smoking altars which could palliate the divine wrath or counteract the divine alienation? When the gates of Paradise were closed, how was it possible for animal sacrifice to open the way to a kind of spiritual paradise? How was it possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sin? The heathen notion of a present to conciliate an angry fetish, or an offering which, apart from any accompanying feeling in the worshipper, could by its intrinsic worth effect any end, having been previously negatived as inharmonious with the facts themselves, and foreign to that early pietism with which we are concerned,—what elements were there in these offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts which could be a source of satisfaction to that Most High God, the possessor of heaven and earth, or that Eternal One, the Almighty, Who challenged Job to impeach His righteousness as well as rival His thunders? It would be a most important element in the comprehension of that phase of the entire doctrine which is under discussion, if it could be ascertained what may reasonably be regarded as the efficient cause in thus obtaining the divine pardon.

The time has not yet come for a precise reply. Some elements in the attainment of forgiveness are clear enough; others are far from clear. It is evident that the forgiveness of sins attended the correct presentation of animal sacrifice, correct presentation consisting in due attention to both the objective and subjective sides. Thus, on the one hand, sacrifices were well-pleasing to God which retained the leading features of that of Abel; and which, on the other hand, were representative of a pious state of mind, of due submissiveness and an accompanying contrition. But when we come to consider what constituted the potency of either feeling or act, what reply have we? Some have dilated upon the practicality of those primitive ages, and have maintained that it is unnecessary to look beyond the symbolic aspects of the question; but such a position, if it is not derogatory to the spirituality of the Old Testament fathers, is assuredly incon-

gruous with the conception they have transmitted to us of the Deity they worshipped. Besides, if sacrifice was only valid because it was symbolic, how are we to account for the fact that centuries after approach had been made to the Deity without the medium of the symbol, the symbol was nevertheless still employed with divine assent and by divine command? how are we to account for the teaching of Genesis, that whilst sacrifice induced prayer, prayer did not supplant sacrifice?[1] Further, the question may be asked even here, —although the settlement of the matter can only be obtained in the study of the Mosaic phase of sacrifice,—Of what was a slaughtered animal symbolic? Is there any hint, even the slightest, in the biblical statements, either directly or inferentially, that any symbolic significance was seen in the act of mactation? All we know for certain is that the patriarchs did attach considerable weight to the objective side of sacrifice, quite apart from the later statements of Prophecy or Gospel, and without approaching by a single step that border-land of charm and magic which equally belonged to a degenerate scriptural and a heathen ceremonial. What part, then, in their opinion, besides the representation of the emotion they themselves experienced, had these slaughtered animals to play in the work of their redemption? They knew that death had been decreed upon their race for its transgression; they saw that by divine permission, suggestion, and command, sheep and oxen became their substitutes, and paid the mortal penalty in their stead; what reason could they assign or imagine for this singular substitution? Did they suspect that their Creator and Preserver was becoming their Teacher, and leading them on from feelings they actually possessed to feelings

[1] The relations between prayer and sacrifice have been warmly discussed, the several views advanced being of course corollaries of the special views advocated of Old Testament Sacrifice, and rising and falling with those views. The only theory it is needful to allude to, is that which identifies the one with the other. Thus Outram says: "Prayers are spiritual sacrifices, and sacrifices are symbolic prayers." This is an important truth, but it requires limitation. The gist of the whole matter is contained in a remark of Hengstenberg's, *Die Opfer der h. Schrift*, p. 9 (*Commentary on Ecclesiastes*, T. & T. Clark, p. 373): "Sacrifice is in the main embodied prayer . . .; but besides the subjective (*innerlich*), the sacrifices of the Old Testament have also an objective (*gegenständlich*) side. . . . Prayer only runs parallel with the subjective side."

He would have them possess? Did they realize the possibility that instinctive suspicions of truth might be preparing the way for divine revelations? As they drew near to God, they knew that the lives of innocent and unoffending animals were taken in lieu of their own, which had been justly forfeited; what did they regard as the reason of this singular vicariate, the foundation of this extraordinary analogy? Whether they ever asked themselves such questions we do not know. Possibly, without interrogation, they thankfully rested in the religious discovery of Abel. But whatever were their opinions, it is sufficiently evident from the data before us that they may have seen in animal sacrifice not only a sensuous representation of their personal feelings, but in the representative material itself an element of prophecy constituting it a type of things to come. Side by side in their experience two truths had been developing,—the one, that somehow or other redemption was *being* obtained by sacrifice; and the other, that somehow or other redemption was *to be* obtained by that seed of the woman which should bruise the serpent's head,[1] that seed of Abraham in which all nations of the earth should be blessed,[2] that Shiloh unto whom should be the gathering of the people.[3] Indeed, in addition to the sacrificial teaching, the promise of a future deliverance had been growing more and more explicit throughout the Patriarchal Age. The general promise of successful conflict with Satan made to Eve's offspring,[4] has become to Noah a promise of salvation through Shem, to Abraham a promise of salvation through Isaac,[5] and to Jacob a promise of world-wide dominion to a Prince who should come from Judah's loins.[6] If the blood of bulls and goats, as from their religious spirit they would instinctively feel, could not remove sin; if, after learning to pray, they had nevertheless received repeated divine approvals of the offering of animal sacrifice, would it have been astonishing if they had connected the two revelations of redemption by sacrifice, and redemption by a coming deliverer?[7] At any rate, there was a sufficiency of reason to create a spirit of expectancy, a

[1] Gen. iii. 15. [2] Gen. xxii. 18. [3] Gen. xlix. 10.
[4] Gen. iii. 15. [5] Gen. xxii. 18. [6] Gen. xlix. 10.
[7] Compare Hengstenberg, *Christologie des Alten Testaments* (translated in

diligent awaiting of events, which stimulated the devout to pursue their habitual method of approaching the throne of God, and at the same time to look in every mother's son for the promised Saviour.

Passing on from the relation of animal sacrifice to the forgiveness of sins, it is necessary to remark that sacrifice was also connected with the whole religious life. Those largely misunderstand the bearings of this central, this solitary form of divine worship, who find its whole purpose in imparting the sense of pardon. It is even probable that in the lives of those ancient heroes of Old Testament story the sense of sin played a far less prominent part than it does in our own more modern experiences; for, as the apostle says, when speaking of one great aim of Mosaism,—the giving objective reality and clearness to the testimony of conscience,—"By the law is the knowledge of sin." The rites of sacrifice, simple as they were, were used for all sorts of religious purposes. They were the instruments of adoration, and faith, and fellowship, and petition, and adjuration, and rejoicing, as well as of penitence. They brought God near to the worshipper, and the worshipper near to God. Whatever religious feeling could stir the manifold heart of man, that feeling could find vent in animal sacrifice. But this point has received sufficient illustration in the present and preceding chapters.

The interest of the Patriarchal Age to a student of the scriptural doctrine of Sacrifice centres in the offerings of Adam and Abel. So long as the hand of Eve was unstretched to the forbidden fruit, so long sacrifice was simple, fearless, entire, and consisted in the total consecration of body, soul, and spirit. The problem of subsequent sacrifice was so to alleviate or annul the consequences of the Fall as to restore that earliest stage of trustful and complete surrender of the whole nature as a *θυσία ζῶσα*. Towards the solution of that problem, but a meagre advance was made in the pre-Mosaic times. Originally suggested by the success which greeted the great discovery of Abel, the patriarchal sacrifices expressed the

Foreign Theological Library, vol. i. pp. 1–89); also Pye Smith, *Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*, 3rd ed. vol. i. pp. 224–239; 6th ed. vol. i. pp. 150–166.

most opposite religious emotions; and although they passed through a course of natural development, and were amended in ritual in accordance with the religious sense of generations, in their most detailed form they were characterized by extreme simplicity nevertheless. Still, powerfully symbolic as they were, whether of things present or things to come, they were but symbols; in this lay their weakness and their transience. The distance between God and man had been bridged, how insecurely! Those slaughtered beasts consuming into smoke might speak of a penitent and eucharistic surrender of the offerer's self to his Maker, but what was there in such a presentation which could restore to man his forfeited religious privileges? Those slaughtered beasts, if regarded from the side not of human presentation so much as of divine precedent, might speak of an appointed method of forgiveness and sanctification, but what part had they to play in the great tragedy of human history? True, some of these privileges *were* regained, some of that tragedy *was* unfolded. It was undeniable that Almighty God *had* bestowed His regard. But much as there undoubtedly was to arouse a sense of thankfulness for such mercy, what was there, immediately the intellect and higher nature of man had become stirred, to satisfy the questionings which, despite of faith, would sometimes be uppermost? If, in some hour of spiritual insight, there came flashing into the soul vague, almost illimitable thoughts upon the divine purposes of grace, what satisfaction was there for intense longings? what certitude amidst perturbing surmises? An unquestioning obedience to precedent had to be brought to the altar where God was, and a hearty and implicit trust only faintly aided by an intangible sense of propriety. Speculation, or an unspeculating adherence to matter-of-fact, there might have been in abundance; of intellectual repose or assurance other than unreasoning faith there was none. "I approach my God in animal sacrifice," was the only possible ejaculation of the devout patriarch, "not because I see its purport clearly, or because the inklings that I have of a mysterious appropriateness in my act have ought that I can express in words, but because He who is my Creator and, in spite of my sin, my Preserver, has deigned to

hallow this altar with His smile, and because I believe that He knows best what is fitting and right, and will, if He thinks well, in due time reveal the purpose which at present is latent in this ordinance." A study of the Mosaic sacrifices will show us the divine revelation of mercy which the patriarchs trusted, and it was counted to them for righteousness, still further unfolding.

PART II.

THE MOSAIC DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE.

"Λαλεῖ ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ νομοθετεῖ πολλάκις, οὐχ ὡς αὐτὸς δύναται, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀκούειν δυνάμεθα."—CHRYSOSTOM, *Homil. in Ps.* XCV.

CHAPTER I.

THE MOSAIC INJUNCTIONS.[1]

"And the Lord said unto Moses, Come up to me into the Mount . . . and I will give thee tables of stone and a law."—Ex. xxiv. 12.

IN the Mosaic cultus the *cæleres ingenii motus* of the Patriarchal Age have become authoritative, and the simple method of adoration of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is supplanted by a worship of many ordinances, more complicated, centralized, gorgeous, and expressive. In Egypt, the enslaved descendants of Israel had been accustomed to witness a princely and powerful hierarchy administering idolatrous rites in splendid temples; in Canaan, as the chosen people of the one "I Am," they possessed a priest-

[1] It may be well to gather into one view once for all the most important literature upon this subject; omitting, however, the very numerous works, the interest of which, because of their allegorizing interpretation, is now great only in an antiquarian point of view. In addition to the well-known Commentaries and Biblical Dictionaries, the following are the principal works written in English:—Moses Lowman, *Rational of the Ritual of the Hebrew Worship*, 1748; P. Fairbairn, *Typology of Scripture* (T. & T. Clark), in two vols. 6th ed. 1876; Litton, *The Mosaic Dispensation*, the Bampton Lecture for 1856; and (if allowance be made for the endeavour of the author to support "by argument derived from his special department of study, the philosophical ideas which all genuine science at present seems eager to establish") Kalisch's *Commentary on Leviticus*, 2 vols. 1867. The more important works in German are:—Bähr, *Symbolik des mosaischen Cultus*, in 2 vols. 1837 (the first volume of a second and largely altered edition was issued at the close of 1875); Hofmann, *Der Schriftbeweis*, 2nd ed. 1857; Hoffmann, *Abhandlungen über die Pentateuchgesetze*, 1878 (valuable for its knowledge of synagogal literature); Keil, *Handbuch der biblischen Archäologie*, first half, "On the Theocratic Relations of the Israelites," 1858 (translated in the *Foreign Theological Library*, 1888); Kliefoth, *Liturgische Abhandlungen*, vol. iv., "Ueber den Alttestamentlichen Cultus," 2nd ed. 1858; Kurtz, *Der Alttestamentliche Opfercultus*, 1862 (translated in *Foreign Theological Library*, 1863); Oehler, articles in Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie* (revised by Orelli in Herzog and Plitt), on "Opfercultus des Alten Testaments," and "Priesterthum;" also his posthumous *Theologie des*

hood as powerful and a ritual as splendid. Instead of a rudimentary conception of a special place of sacrificial worship such as was current in earlier times, the Mosaic injunctions present us with one prescribed place where alone sacrifice was legitimate; in place of a faint suggestion of a separate order of sacrificial ministrants, there is an ordained class whose duty and prerogative it was to present offerings: a simple sacrificial ritual, equally utilized in the expression of feelings the most opposite and various, has become an established series of special forms, each adapted, after severe preparation, to express some distinct religious emotion; whilst an indiscriminate timeliness of sacrifice has yielded to a minute and developed doctrine of sacrificial times and seasons. The cotyledonary spiritual growth of patriarchal worship has become in Mosaism differentiated into root and stem and branch.

But before proceeding to the detailed examination of the Mosaic injunctions, it will be well to pause for a few moments, in order to note briefly two religious rites, which, retaining something of the undifferentiated character of the patriarchal

Alten Testaments, vol. i. "Mosaismus," 1873 (translated in *Foreign Theological Library*, 1875); many good articles in Riehm, *Handwörterbuch des Biblischen Alterthums*, 1884; Salvador, *Histoire des Institutions de Moïse*, 3rd ed. 1862; Wangemann, *Das Opfer nach Lehre der heiligen Schrift*, 2 vols. 1866; and, if used with discrimination, the following works of the "Critical" school:—Ewald, *Die Alterthümer des Volkes Israel*, 3rd ed. 1866 (Eng. Trans. 1876); Knobel, *Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus erklärt*, 1857; Piepenbring, *Théologie de l'Ancien Testament*, 1886; and Schultz, *Alttestamentliche Theologie*, 4th ed. 1889. There are also several works written in Latin, which, despite their obsolete reasoning, are of the highest value from their *répertoire* of materials,—viz., Outram, *De Sacrificiis*, 1st ed. 1677 (of which a useful English translation was published in 1817); Spencer, *De Legibus Hebræorum et earum Rationibus*, 1st ed. 1685; and, in addition to these two treatises by Englishmen, the monumental work of the Jewish proselyte Ugolino, published at Venice in 1744 69, the *Thesaurus Antiquitatum Sacrarum*, in 34 vols., a collection of previous contributions to the study of the Jewish Antiquities. If help is required from a knowledge of the Jewish rites and customs as practised at the time of our Lord, reference should be made to the writings of Philo, especially "De Sacerdotium Honoribus," "De Victimis," and "De Victimas Offerentibus," and the numerous Rabbinic extracts to be found in Buxtorf, *Lexicon Chaldaicum et Talmudicum*, 1639; Godwyn, *Moses and Aaron*, 1st ed. 1616; Lightfoot, *Ministerium Templi*, 1st ed. 1684; and Reland, *Antiquitates Sacræ veterum Hebræorum*, 1708. For a critical estimate of these works from a biblical standpoint, see Part III. chap. iv.

service, and yet presenting features foreign to that service, were manifestly transitional,—that is to say, the Passover and the Sacrifice of the Covenant, the first suggestive rites of the new *régime*.

The night of the Exodus, memorable for its deliverance, was also memorable in the history of sacrifice. At the moment when the cry rose from every Egyptian household at the death of the first-born, in every Hebrew home the entire family, non-decimated by the destroying angel, was standing with loins girt and staff in hand, hurriedly partaking of a sacrificial meal. The reason was simple. The enslaved nation was celebrating by divine command its first Passover.[1] A lamb or kid, a male and physically immaculate, selected four days previously, had been slain at sunset in every household; the blood of the victim had been obediently sprinkled by means of a branch of hyssop upon the posts and lintel of the front-door, and the carcase, roasted whole, was being hastily eaten with bitter herbs and unleavened bread. Postponing to a later stage of our inquiry the minuter details of this ritual, it is sufficient now to remark that the significance of this sacrifice of the Passover lies upon the surface. Undoubtedly there is here—as, indeed, might be expected from the fact that a special revelation was given upon the subject—no service of the ancient form; none the less, whether the significant manipulation with blood or the meal itself were regarded, was this "Last Supper" of the deepest religious import. On the one hand, this sacrifice was an atonement sufficiently potent to stay the arm of the angel of death; and, on the other hand, the sacrifice was a sacrament, in which to the merciful sparing of life there was added a divinely provided sustenance for trials yet to come. In one eloquent ceremonial the leading features of Mosaism were prophetically embodied.

In the early days of the life of the liberated Israelites yet another memorable sacrificial service is chronicled.[2] After the first return of Moses from the summit of Sinai, and the proclamation to the tribes of the decalogue, and of the civil and religious rites which are enumerated in the twentieth and

[1] Ex. xii. [2] Ex. xxiv.

three following chapters of the Exodus, the solemn covenant between Jehovah and His children was religiously concluded by the effusion of blood and holy feasting. An altar having been erected, and surrounded by twelve pillars, according to the number of the tribes, victims were slain for burnt-offerings and festal-offerings.[1] During the process the blood of the slaughtered animals was collected in basins, and subsequently swung by Moses one half upon the altar, and the other half upon the assembled people. It is no part of our purpose to recount or controvert the many opinions which have been held concerning the nature, the origin, or the significance of this Sacrifice of the Covenant; these opinions have for the most part arisen from that mistaken method which ignores historical progress. Instead of searching the detailed statements of Leviticus for an explanation of this ceremony, it is far more instructive to adhere to the actual evolution of events. Thus studied, this rite of the covenant is seen in fact to be a patriarchal festal-offering such as was offered by Jacob at his covenant with Laban, *with the peculiar ritual of blood-manipulation of the Passover superadded.* Every soul in the camp would know, as the odorous smoke curled upwards from the altar, that he was personally taking God to solemn witness of his vow to keep that law which Moses had just recited; every soul would know, as the drops of blood fell from the uplifted hand of Moses upon his head and garments, that once more the angel of death had passed him by; and, as he ate and drank of the roasted bullock and its accompanying drink-offerings, every soul would know that the Lord had again provided for his physical need, and, so long as the covenant stood intact, would still provide.

These two important rites, to which we have thus cursorily alluded, were inaugural. They broke the monotony of the past; they concentrated attention upon the revelations yet to come. It was manifestly their purpose to prepare the way for a more elaborate system and a more circumstantial revelation. Immediately after the elders beheld the glorious vision

[1] Not "peace-offerings," as the Authorized Version and the Revised Version translate, thereby introducing inexplicable confusion into the study of the Mosaic injunctions,—peace-offerings are as yet unknown.

of Deity resting as it were upon a sapphire pavement as clear as the blue heavens, by which the covenant was divinely ratified, the first announcements of that more complex system were made; and announcements continued to be made, now from Sinai, and now from between the wings of the cherubim in the Holiest, until the days immediately preceding the death of Moses.

A study of the Mosaic worship, like that of the pre-Mosaic Age, is attended with considerable difficulty, and from the same causes, though not to the same extent. Remoteness, irrecoverable *hiatus* in the records, and a genius foreign to western civilization and Christianity, are extremely baffling to any attempt at the reconstruction of the earliest phase of Judaism. Nor can we hope for any material assistance from writings or traditions outside the pale of Holy Writ. It might perhaps be expected, with apparent justice, that in the case of Mosaism any elements of difficulty in its study due to the Pentateuch would be more than counterbalanced by the knowledge of those early times to be obtained from the extant writings of Josephus, Philo, and the authors and commentators of the Talmud and its allied compositions: modern Jewish traditions and customs might even be expected to render some assistance; but unfortunately, the numerous additions and perversions made in the Mosaic law in later times rendered a caution necessary so early as the days of our Lord against the "traditions of the elders," and the Jewish customs of to-day are even more at variance with the precepts of the Pentateuch than they were then. It is much if a suggestion gathered here and there at immense cost can throw a probable light upon earlier usage; for the most part, such aids are of the slightest possible value. The only authentic sources for the study of Mosaism are the books of the Pentateuch, and the occasional gleams of light that fall from the later canonical books. It is from necessity as well as from choice that our exposition of Mosaism is scriptural.

As an indispensable preliminary to an analysis of the Mosaic doctrine of Sacrifice, it will be necessary to classify, as methodically and succinctly as possible, the diffuse series of sacrificial commands given at different times to Moses.

Many obstacles lie in the way of completeness; nevertheless, by avoiding on the one side the mistake of over-generalization, and on the other that of too statistical minuteness, it must be our endeavour to obtain from the sources to our hand as accurate a knowledge as possible of the Mosaic contributions to our subject. In the first place, we shall present the several injunctions which concern the Tabernacle or place of sacrifice; in the second, those which concern the Priests or sacrificial ministrants; in the third, those which concern the Purifications or legal preparations for sacrifice; in the fourth, those which concern the several Sacrifices themselves; and, in the last, those which treat of the sacrificial Times and Seasons, concluding the chapter with a brief *résumé* of the entire Mosaic ceremonial. This antiquarian chapter, to which attention is especially requested in spite of its detail and dryness, will be succeeded by five chapters upon the various significations of the antiquities here classified. It is only necessary to add by way of further caution, that the Levitical injunctions are not arranged in this chapter in the order in which they were given, but as they collectively appeared at the death of the lawgiver. It is not desired to present a history of the successive amendments or expansions which the Law underwent before the entry into the Land of Promise, but a general view of the worship as it remained throughout Old Testament times.

It is as impossible as it is unnecessary for our purpose to resolve, from the data given in the Exodus, all the questions of detail which have been started concerning the sacred edifice called the Tabernacle.[1] Nor should such resolution be ex-

[1] For the principal studies upon the Tabernacle, see Bähr, *Symbolik*, ed. 1, vol. i. pp. 55–498; ed. 2, vol. i. pp. 65–602; Ewald, *Alterthümer*, pp. 156–173; Fairbairn, *Typology*, vol. ii. pp. 232–257, 291, etc.; Friederich, *Symbolik des mos. Stiftshütte*, 1841; Hengstenberg, *Authentie des Pentateuch*, vol. ii. p. 628, etc.; Keil, *Archäologie*, vol. i. pp. 76–119 (translated in *Foreign Theological Library*, pp. 98–162); Knobel, *Exodus*, pp. 245–336; Kurtz, *Alttest. Opfer*. §§ 10–16 (translated in *Foreign Theological Library*); Leyrer, article "Stiftshütte," in Herzog, vol. xv. pp. 92–117, and Riggenbach, same title, in Herzog and Plitt, vol. xiv. pp. 712–727; Lowman, *Hebrew Ritual*, pp. 67–106; Neumann, *Die Stiftshütte*, 1861; Oehler, *Alttest. Theologie* (translated in *Foreign Theological Library*), §§ 114–120; Outram, *De Sacrificiis*, caps. ii. and iii.; Philo, *Quis Rerum divinarum Hæres;* Riggenbach, *Die mosaische*

pected. Had words sufficed for the description of the entire structure to its minutest features, the vision might have been spared in which the whole was accurately placed before the eyes of the seer. The principal facts may be gathered, nevertheless, from the two sections of the Exodus,[1]—the one of which narrates the divine injunctions as they were given to Moses, and significantly enough commences with the mercy-seat; the other of which chronicles the actual course of erection, and begins with the construction of the Tabernacle proper. This Tabernacle, where alone sacrifice could be offered under capital penalties,[2] was built of the free-will and compulsory offerings of the entire people, and consisted of a portable building surrounded on all sides by an extemporized court-yard. It was always so pitched on encampment that it stood in the centre of the congregation, and the beams of the rising sun passed through its entrance.[3] The Tabernacle proper was an oblong of Shittim[4] planks, plated with gold and fitted with silver, thirty cubits in length, ten in breadth, and ten in height. Over this wooden framework hung four coverings in such a way as to simulate a tent, whence the name of the whole. The innermost covering[5] was in ten strips so joined as to form two halves, which were united by gold hooks and blue eyes, and consisted of tapestry of white and purple and scarlet and blue, with cherubim interwoven—"the work of

Stiftshütte, ed. 1, 1862; ed. 2, 1867; Schultz, *Alttest. Theologie*, ed. 4, 1889, vol. i. pp. 318–327; Van Til, *Commentar. de Tabernaculo Mosaico*, 1711, and in Ugolino, vol. viii.; Witsius, *Miscellanea Sacra*, vol. i. p. 393, etc.

[1] Ex. xxv.–xxvii. and xxxv.–xxxviii.

[2] Lev. xvii. 3–5.

[3] Ex. xxvi. 18–23, xxxvi. 25–27; Num. iii. 38.

[4] The Shittim was probably the *Acacia vera*, a species with white thorns, blackish legumes, and a hard and light wood (see Hasæus, "De Ligno Shittim," Ugolino, vol. viii.).

[5] Bähr argues in his valuable work upon the Mosaic symbolism, that this covering of parti-coloured tapestry was not placed *outside* the wooden framework of the Tabernacle, but was so arranged as to cover not only the ceiling, but the inner walls, leaving, however, the plated planks peeping like a wainscot for a cubit from the ground; and Bähr has been followed by Keil, Kurtz, and Neumann, also by Fairbairn. This is not the place to undertake an exhaustive examination of the matter, but the opinion in the text is the common one, and, since Bähr's exposition, has been maintained by Ewald, Friederich, Knobel, Leyrer, and Riggenbach.

the thinker."[1] The three other coverings acted as tent cloths outside this more brilliant and symbolic one, and were made of cloth of goat's hair, the covering of Arab tents to this day, of reddened rams' skins, the common red leather of Syria and Palestine,[2] and of the skins of the sea-cow[3] respectively. On the open or east side a curtain of Egyptian byssus, Tyrian purple, carmesin or a burning scarlet, and hyacinth or a dark blue—of the same material, in fact, as the innermost covering, with the exception of the figures of cherubim—was suspended on five pillars of gilded acacia sunk in copper sockets, and formed the entrance. Within, the Tabernacle proper was divided into two parts by another curtain called the Veil, of the same materials as the tapestry of the ceiling, and suspended on four gilded pillars of acacia sunk in silver sockets; the part to the west of the veil being a cube of ten cubits in the edge, and called, according to the common Hebrew idiom for pre-eminent excellence, the Holy of Holies, or the Holiest; the remaining space, of the same breadth and height but double the length, being called the Holy Place. Around the Tabernacle proper ran an open space, one hundred cubits long and fifty cubits broad, called the Court, enclosed by curtains of twisted white byssus,[4] hung by the aid of pegs and cords upon sixty pillars of acacia five cubits high, with silver capitals and connecting rods and brass sockets, these curtains being absent for a space of twenty cubits on the east side,

[1] Ex. xxvi. 36 (Heb.). Compare Gesenius, *Thesaurus Philologicus Criticus Heb. et Chald.*, vol. iii. p. 1310.

[2] Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, p. 97.

[3] "The sea-cow is evidently meant (Dujong, Manati, Halicore), which belongs to the same tribe as the dolphin. It is found in the Red Sea, reaches a length of from 8 to 10 feet, is hunted like the whale, and has a skin which is much used for sandals and shields."—Knobel, *Exodus*, p. 260.

[4] A great controversy has raged as to whether this *shesh* was made of flax or cotton. Foster, *De Bysso Antiquorum*, 1776, concluded that *shesh* was a cotton stuff. Recent researches would seem to countenance the statement of Pliny: "Superior pars Ægypti in Arabiam vergens gignit fruticem, quem aliqui gossypion vocant, plures xylon et ideo lina inde facta xylina . . . Vestes inde sacerdotibus Ægypti gratissimæ" (*Historia Naturalis*, Book XIX. cap. i.). Any who are interested in the question will find valuable notes in Keil, *Archäologie*, vol. i. p. 80 (Eng. Transl. vol. i. p. 105); and in Bähr, *Symbolik*, ed. 2, vol. i. pp. 282 291. The Septuagint invariably translates *shesh* by *byssus*, and, as the name has almost become acclimatized, the author retains it.

which was closed by a curtain of similar material to that which formed the entrance to the Holy Place. The position of the more solid structure within the court has not been further described, but was probably such that the space before the Holy Place was a square of fifty cubits.[1] All the tools used in the erection or removal of the Tabernacle were commanded to be of copper.

Circumstantial descriptions were also given to Moses of the utensils appropriate to the several divisions of the Tabernacle. In the Court, the popular place of sacrificial worship, stood the altar of burnt-offering and the laver. The altar[2] was a square portable coffer of acacia copper-plated within and without, and filled with earth or rough stones so as to form a level hearth; it was surrounded by a raised platform, along which the officiating priest could move, reached by an inclined plane on the north side; at the four corners of the altar were projections like the horns of oxen; its utensils—its ash-pans, its shovels, its basins, its flesh-hooks, its pans for fuel—were made of copper. After the conspiracy of Korah and his company, the censers that had contained the profane fire were beaten into plates and added to the altar.[3] The laver was a round basin resting upon a pedestal, both basin and support being made of the copper mirrors of the women who served before the door of the Tabernacle;[4] it was used by the priests for purposes of purification in the services of the Holy Place and of the altar of burnt-offering. In the Holy Place stood the altar of incense, the table of shew-bread, and the golden candlestick, upon which no eyes fell but those of the priesthood. The altar of incense was a portable box of acacia fitted with horns like the altar of burnt-offering, and so over-

[1] Philo, *De Vita Mosis*, quoted by Bähr, ed. 1, vol. i. p. 70.

[2] F. von Meyer has the merit of clearly unfolding the structure of this altar in his *Bibeldeutungen*, p. 206, etc. English readers will find Meyer's plan and elevation in Fairbairn, *Typology*, vol. ii. p. 530.

[3] Num. xvi. 39.

[4] "It is the custom of all women to behold their face every morning in a mirror, that they may be able to dress their hair; but, lo! there were women in Israel that served the Lord, who abandoned this worldly delight and gave away their glasses as a free-will offering, for they had no more use for them."—Aben-Ezra, quoted by Lightfoot, Pitman's edition, vol. ix. p. 419.

laid with thin plates of gold upon its sides, its top, and its horns, as to be appropriately called the Golden Altar; it stood against the veil. The table of shew-bread, or face-bread, was an ornamental acacia table entirely plated with gold, placed on the north side; upon it were laid plates, goblets, and sacrificial spoons, all of gold; the table received its name from the cakes of bread which were exposed upon it "before the face" of the Lord. The golden candlestick was a lamp standing opposite the table of shew-bread, with seven arms ornamented with almond blossoms, made throughout of wrought gold, its needful appliances being also of gold. In the Holy of Holies, the sacred floor of which was trodden but one day in the year by the high priest at the solemn ceremony of the Day of Atonement, there was but one article of furniture—the Ark of the Covenant or of the Testimony. It consisted of two parts—the Ark proper, and the Capporeth or Mercy-seat. The Ark proper was a rectangular acacia box, plated within and without with the purest gold; within it were placed the two stone tables given to Moses on Sinai, and subsequently the Book of the Law, Aaron's rod that budded, and a pot of manna. The *capporeth*, which formed the lid of the box just described, was a plate of massy gold, having at either end a golden cherub,[1] the faces of which were turned towards each other, and the wings of which overshadowed the space beneath. It was within that sacred space, aglow with gold, dark with the shechinah, that Jehovah had said, "And there I will meet with thee."

The entire sanctuary was solemnly consecrated by anointing oil on the first day of the second year of the sojourn in the wilderness; and the cloud by day and fire by night

[1] Into the disputed question as to the form of the cherubim we do not enter. Von Gerlach suggested that biblical analogy would lead us to think their faces human, their necks leonine, their bodies and feet those of a bull, and their wings those of an eagle. So Spencer, *De Legibus Hebræorum*, Book III. Dissert. v. cap. iv., had already maintained in his highly interesting dissertation on the subject, that, according to scriptural and profane testimony, the cherubim were "simulacra aurea, multiformia, ad formam tamen vitulinam propius accedentia." Able summaries of the question from different standpoints will be found in Keil, *Archäologie*, vol. i. p. 86, note 5 (Eng. Trans. vol. i. pp. 110–120); Oehler, *Theologie des A. T.* (translated in *Foreign Theological Library*), vol. i. § 119; and the latest and most elaborate statement, Bähr, *Symbolik*, ed. 2, pp. 362–381.

thenceforth testified that where the Tabernacle rested, there Jehovah dwelt.

From the injunctions concerning the place of sacrificial worship, we proceed in the second place to those which treat of the sacrificial ministrants or Priesthood.[1] According to the Sinaitic proclamation, the tribe of Levi was constituted sole administrator in the public worship of the nation.[2] But the consecration of this tribe did not proceed on a principle of equality of privilege. Amongst those specially set apart for holy purposes, there was a triple gradation,—of Levites, of Levites of the family of Aaron, and of Levites the successive heads of the family of Aaron.

The Levites proper were not priests—that is, they did not perform sacrifice. They were assistants and servants to the priests. Their duties, generally stated, were apparently to understand and teach the law of Jehovah,[3] and, in addition to this general vocation, to perform special duties in the transport and service of the sanctuary, according to their families,—as Kohathites, Gershonites, and Merarites.[4] To these labours they were consecrated at an age of from twenty-five to thirty[5] by a process of purification.[6] They received an adequate

[1] Compare Bähr, *Symbolik*, ed. 1, vol. ii. pp. 3–188; Baudissin, *Die Geschichte des Alttest. Priesterthums*, 1889; Ewald, *Alterthümer*, pp. 345–396 (translated); Fairbairn, *Typology*, vol. ii. pp. 258–291; Kalisch, *Leviticus*, Essay B.; Keil, *Archäologie*, vol. i. pp. 151–187 (translation, vol. i. pp. 204–245); Küper, *Das Priesterthum des Alten Bundes*, 1866; Kurtz, *Alttest. Opfercultus* (translated in *Foreign Theological Library*), §§ 6–9; Lowman, *Hebrew Ritual*, pp. 107–143; Maybaum, *Die Entwicklung des Israelit. Priesterthums*, 1880; Oehler, articles "Hohepriester," "Leviten," "Priesterthum," in Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, vols. vi. viii. and xii. (revised by Orelli in Herzog and Plitt), and *Theologie des A. T.* (translated in *Foreign Theological Library*), vol. i. §§ 92–96; Outram, *De Sacrificiis*, Book I. cap. iv.–vii.; Schultz, *Alttest. Theologie*, ed. 4, vol. i. pp. 307–318; Tholuck, *Das Alte Testament im Neuen Testament*, §§ 2 and 4 of the 2nd part; Wangemann, *Das Opfer nach Lehre der heil. Schrift*, vol. i. pp. 143–145, and vol. ii. pp. 77–114; and the monographs by Boldich, Braun, Carpzov, Saubert, and Selden, in Ugolino, vol. xii.

[2] A little later, however, Joshua appointed some of the Gibeonites to the more menial offices of service, to be "hewers of wood and drawers of water." These Gibeonites and their descendants were afterwards known as the Nethinim (Josh. ix. 21–27; Deut. xxix. 11; 1 Chron. x. 2; Neh. xi. 3).

[3] 2 Chron. xvii. 8, 9; Neh. viii. 10.

[4] Num. iv. 1–49; xviii. 2–7.

[5] Num. viii. 23, 26.

[6] Num. viii. 5–22.

means of support in the tithes[1] given by the whole nation, and a convenient dwelling-place in their thirty-five cities. Upon further specific commands concerning the Levites, it is unnecessary for us to dwell.[2]

The regulations concerning the Aaronites, as being more intimately connected with our subject, must be enunciated at a little greater length. They alone were eligible for the distinctive office of the priesthood, the consummation of sacrifice; and they alone were admitted, as familiars of Jehovah and equals of angels, into the Holy Place.[3] They were supported by tithes; but whereas the Levites received one-tenth of the whole national produce, the priests received a tenth of the tithe.[4] The priests also received as stipend the offerings of first-fruits,[5] the ransoms of the first-born,[6] and portions of every kind of sacrifice except the burnt-offerings and those offerings which were made in atonement of their own sins or those of the united people. Thirteen cities were apportioned as their place of residence.[7] As prerequisites of service, every priest had, in addition to his hereditary qualification, to give proof upon examination of possessing an immaculate physical constitution,[8] and probably also, as in the case of the Levites, of having attained a prescribed age. They were consecrated to

[1] Num. xviii. 21–32.

[2] There was apparently no special clothing for the Levites in the time of Moses. In later times they had a dress of white (2 Chron. v. 12).

[3] In later times, certain members of the family of Aaron had more honourable duties and offices than simple officiation at the altar. Thus there was a *sagan* or assistant to the high priest, two *catholikin* or assistants to the *sagan*, an executive for the treasury, seven keepers of the keys, the several *chiefs of the watch* or heads of the priestly courses, the *heads of houses* who were the chiefs of the priestly families, and the priest *anointed for war* who accompanied the tribes in battle.

[4] Num. xviii. 26–28.

[5] Num. xviii. 8–12.

[6] Lev. xxvii. 26; Num. xviii. 17; Deut. xv. 19. Comp. Ex. xiii. 12; Num. xviii. 15, 16.

[7] Later, priests were distributed by lot through thirteen Levitical cities. See Josh. xxi. 4.

[8] Lev. xxi. 16–24. "A priest upon whom was found anything profanatory, put on black garments, and esteemed himself black, and went his way; but he upon whom nothing profanatory was found, put on white garments, and esteemed himself white, and went in and served with his brothers the priests." Quoted by Oehler from the *Mishna Middoth*. Is there any reference to this in the "clothing with white raiment" in Rev. iii. 5?

their sacred office by a minute service,[1] which consisted of two sets of acts,—in the first place, of purification, investiture, and anointing; and in the second place, of a triple sacrifice, of a bullock for a sin-offering, a ram for a burnt-offering, and a ram for a peace-offering. With respect to their habit of life, little is said further than that they are forbidden to eat anything that had died a natural death or been torn by beasts,[2] to touch the dead body of any except those of their own kin,[3] to shave either head or beard,[4] to marry a dissolute, dishonoured, or divorced woman,[5] or to drink wine when approaching the sanctuary.[6] After the primary investiture, all priests wore, "for glory and for beauty," a special attire,[7] consisting of a byssus coat,[8] a byssus mitre,[9] byssus breeches,[10] and a girdle made of byssus interwoven with the distinctive colours of the Tabernacle—hyacinth, purple, and scarlet.[11] By the silence of the Scriptures upon further articles of clothing, the rabbinic tradition is substantiated, that the priests served barefoot.[12]

In addition to the distinctions of rank amongst the families

[1] Ex. xxix. 1–37; Lev. viii. 1–36.

[2] Lev. xxii. 8.

[3] Lev. xxi. 1–4.

[4] Lev. xxi. 5.

[5] Lev. xxi. 7.

[6] Lev. x. 9. This command has been the occasion of considerable sophistry on the part of the Rabbis, as may be gathered from a passage in Maimonides, which has been quoted by several investigators, and which we append, partly as a Rabbinic curiosity, and partly as an instance of the little aid to be expected upon the earlier practice of Mosaism from the later customs of the Jews. This is the extract:—"A priest prepared for service, just after having drunk wine, is forbidden to penetrate beyond the altar. If he penetrate farther and officiate, his ministry is vain, and he is devoted to death. But this is to be understood of him who has drunk a quarter of a log (not quite a quarter of a pint) of fresh wine forty days old, without any space of time having elapsed after drinking. But if he has drunk less than a quarter of a log, or even if he has drunk a quarter of a log, but either some interval of time has passed after drinking or he has mixed water with the wine, or, finally, if he has drunk wine less than forty days old, then, although he has drunk more than a quarter of a log, he is free from blame, nor does he profane his ministry." This may be very good law in the eyes of a scribe, but what verdict must be passed upon the eyes?

[7] The great book upon the priestly vestments is Braun, *Vestitus Sacerdotum Hebræorum*, 1st ed. 1698, 2nd ed. 1701; also printed in Ugolino.

[8] Ex. xxxix. 27.

[9] Ex. xxxix. 28.

[10] Ex. xxviii. 42.

[11] Lightfoot states that the priestly girdle was all of white; but whatever was the habit in later times, in Mosaic times it was parti-coloured.

[12] Comp. Ex. iii. 5; Josh. v. 15.

of Levi, there was also a distinction in the family of Aaron. To one priest, the head of the family,—the priest *par excellence*, sometimes called "the anointed priest," and in later times the "high priest,"[1]—was given the proud position of sacerdotal supremacy. His privileges and prerogatives, many and awe-inspiring, need only be referred to as they affect our general inquiry. Whilst participating in all the duties and immunities of the ordinary priesthood, he had some rights and offices none could share. His consecration was more pompous and magnificent, occupying seven days, and partaking in an extended form of the usual steps of purification, investiture, anointing, and sacrifice.[2] In his mode of life, his was to be a stricter cleanliness and a more ceremonial purity. His attire bespoke higher honour; for, in addition to the common priestly vestments, he wore for greater glory and richer beauty the so-called *golden* garments,—viz. an upper garment, richly woven in blue, and hung with blue, purple, and scarlet pomegranates and golden bells alternately; upon this tunic the curious ephod,[3] the distinctive badge of his office, with its accompanying jewelled breastplate, and in addition to the common priestly mitre an upper mitre or crown of gold, engraved with the words, "Holiness to the Lord." To the high priest fell the solemn duties of the Day of Atonement.

The next series of injunctions has to do with the Levitical purifications.[4] According to the Mosaic law, there

[1] This expression, which is never found in the Pentateuch, is first mentioned in 2 Kings xii. 10. In the Pentateuch, Aaron and his successor are designated "the priest," as if, as Ewald, *Alterthümer*, p. 346, puts it, any more distinctive name was unnecessary.

[2] Outram states, on rabbinic authority, that after the consumption of the sacred anointing oil made by Moses, the oil was never made again, the step of anointing being dropped out of the rite of initiation.

[3] "The hierarchic ephod must not be confounded with the linen ephod which the ordinary priests and other persons wore in divine service. See Judg. viii. 27; 1 Sam. ii. 18, xxii. 18; 2 Sam. vi. 14."—Küper, *Das Priesterthum*, note on p. 58.

[4] Compare Bähr, *Symbolik*, ed. 1, vol. ii. pp. 454–522; Ewald, *Alterthümer*, pp. 143–145; Fairbairn, *Typology*, vol. ii. pp. 408–428; Keil, *Archäologie*, vol. i. pp. 268–308 (Eng. Trans. vol. i. pp. 368–414); Kurtz, *Alttest. Opfercultus* (translated in *Foreign Theological Library*), §§ 213–218; Leyrer, article "Reinigungen" in Herzog, vol. xii., and König, article "Reinigungen" in

were certain physical conditions which made it impossible for their subject to approach the sanctuary without crime, or to partake of those things which were "holy to the Lord."[1] In the technical language of the law, there were certain physical conditions which rendered their subject "unclean." The "unclean" were temporarily cut off from the theocratic privileges of the Israelite, whether priest or common person; but these theocratic privileges were restored upon the dutiful fulfilment of the rites of purification. These rites, being frequently therefore the indispensable antecedents of sacrifice, call for some attention.

Purification was effected either by water or by blood.

The aqueous purifications were as follows: — For the Levites who led the scapegoat into the wilderness on the Day of Atonement, and who burnt the remains of the several sin-offerings, for the priests who slaughtered and burnt the red heifer in the ceremony to be presently described, and for the uncleanness arising under the law from conjugal intercourse, involuntary seminal emission, menstruation, and contact with a human or animal corpse. It was simply necessary, for those who were rendered impure by the ceremony of the Day of Atonement, to wash their clothes and bathe their bodies, in order to resume their normal condition in the eyes of the law.[2] The priest also and his assistants, who prepared the water of separation from the ashes of the heifer, became pure on washing their clothes and bodies the same evening, remaining unclean, however, in the interim.[3] The husband and wife who had been rendered incapable of attending divine service by intercourse, remained unclean till the evening, when they were ordered to bathe.[4] Involuntary seminal emission placed amongst the unclean till the evening, when the uncleanness passed away upon bathing the person and washing any garments or skins the semen had touched;[5] in time of war such an one must go out of the camp during the hours of unclean-

Herzog and Plitt, vol. xii.; Oehler, *Theologie des A. T.* (translated in *Foreign Theological Library*), §§ 142, 143; and Spencer, *De Lustrationibus et Purificationibus Hebræorum*, reprinted in Ugolino, vol. xxii.

[1] Lev. vii. 20, 21. [2] Lev. xvi. 26–28. [3] Num. xix. 7–22.
[4] Lev. xv. 18. [5] Lev. xv. 16, 17.

ness.[1] During the menstrual period, the woman, her bed, and her clothing (and in certain cases, her husband), were impure for seven days, purification being effected by washing and bathing.[2] The touch of the carcase of an animal that had died a natural death, necessitated separation till the evening, and subsequent bathing.[3] Allied to these forms of purification were those previously mentioned, by which the priests and Levites were consecrated to their office, and by which the priests daily prepared themselves for service.

Another aqueous purification of a peculiar kind, viz. the singular ceremony for counteracting the contamination of a human corpse, needs a paragraph to itself. A dead body rendered all impure in its immediate neighbourhood. To be in a tent at the time of the death of an inmate, to enter a tent where a dead body lay, to touch a corpse, a grave, or a bone, was to contract uncleanness for seven days. The very pots and pans in the neighbourhood of a corpse were defiled. Purification was effected by sprinkling with water mingled with ashes, expressly prepared by the sacrifice of a red heifer. The sons of Israel brought to the son of the high priest a spotless red heifer, which was slaughtered without the camp as a sin-offering. The officiating priest (still without the camp) then sprinkled some of the blood collected in the process of slaughter seven times towards the Tabernacle, and burnt the carcase with the skin, blood, and dung, throwing cedar-wood, hyssop, and scarlet wool into the fire. The ashes were collected by one who was ceremonially clean, and preserved in a clean place for subsequent use. When any one presented himself for purification, the following ceremony took place: Some of the ashes thus prepared and preserved were mixed with living, that is to say, running or spring, water,[4] and a legally clean man taking a bunch of hyssop and dipping it in the water on the third and seventh day after defilement, sprinkled the tent, and the vessels and persons it contained. After washing and bathing of the person, the unclean became pure in the evening.[5]

[1] Deut. xxiii. 10. [2] Lev. xv. 19–24. [3] Lev. xi. 25, 26, 36, 40.

[4] Maimonides defines this living water as "ex fontibus scaturientibus aut ex fluviis rapide fluentibus."

[5] Num. xix.

Certain temporary forms of impurity were removed by animal sacrifice. After the birth of a boy, the mother was unclean for forty days, and after the birth of a girl for eighty. At the lapse of those times she might present herself at the altar, bringing a lamb for a burnt-offering, and a young pigeon or dove for a sin-offering; or, if she was poor, a pigeon might be substituted for the lamb.[1] Any irregular uterine or urethral discharge rendered impure as long as it lasted, and for seven days after its cessation. On the eighth day two pigeons were to be brought, the one as a burnt, and the other as a sin offering, when the uncleanness was removed.[2] A ceremony of the same class, but more intricate, constituted the method of cleansing the leper when once his leprosy had departed. The purification was divided into two series of acts, performed at intervals of seven days. On the first day the priest examined the leper without the camp, and, if he was assured of his cure, sent for two living birds, a piece of cedar-wood, some scarlet wool, and a few sprigs of hyssop. He then killed one of the birds in such a manner that its blood mingled with living water contained in a vessel beneath. After this, the live bird, the cedar, the wool, and the hyssop were dipped together into the vessel. With the water thus prepared the leper was sprinkled seven times, and the live bird was allowed to fly away. The second series of acts were commenced seven days afterwards, by shaving the head, the beard, and the eyebrows, washing the clothes, and bathing the body. The next day a process of sacrifice was gone through, consisting, in the first place, of the presentation of a lamb and a little oil as a trespass-offering, some of the blood of the former and a few drops of the latter being applied during the ritual to the right ear, the right thumb, and the great toe of the right foot; and, in the second place, of sheep and flour for sin-offerings, burnt-offerings, and meat-offerings.[3] It should be noted that those who suffered from urethral or uterine discharge and from leprosy, as well as those whose impurity arose from contact with a corpse, were not only disallowed from entering the court of the Tabernacle, but were also, so long as their impurity lasted, banished the camp.

[1] Lev. xii. 1–8. [2] Lev. xv. 1–15, and 25–30. [3] Lev. xiv.

In addition to these ceremonies of individual purification, on occasions of the bestowal of great spiritual blessing the whole nation was bidden consecrate itself by special preparation. Such national sanctification preceded the giving of the law at Sinai [1] and the passage of the Jordan,[2] the two chief events in the history of the Wanderings; and analogous cases on a more limited scale may be found in the sanctification of the house of Jesse before the anointing of David,[3] and of the tribe of Levi previous to the religious reforms of Hezekiah.[4]

The next class of injunctions concerns the Sacrifices themselves.[5]

In a complete survey, these injunctions must be considered both from the standpoint of the material of which sacrifices were made, and from the standpoint of the persons who made them.

In the classification of the sacrificial injunctions from the

[1] Ex. xix. 10, 11, 14, 15.

[2] Josh. iii. 5.

[3] 1 Sam. xvi. 5.

[4] 2 Chron. xxix. 5.

[5] The following is a list of the principal works which have been written on the subject of the Mosaic Sacrifices:—Bähr, *Symbolik*, ed. 1, vol. ii. pp. 189–324; Ebrard, *Die Lehre von der stellvertretenden Genugthuung in der heiligen Schrift begründet*, 1857; Ewald, *Alterthümer*, pp. 31–90; Fairbairn, *Typology*, vol. ii. pp. 320–361; Hengstenberg, *Die Opfer der heiligen Schrift*, 1859 (appended to *Comment. on Ecclesiastes*, *Foreign Theological Library*); Hofmann, *Der Schriftbeweis*, 2d ed. 1857, pp. 214–294; Kalisch, *Leviticus*, Essay A.; Keil, *Archäologie*, pp. 195–265 (Eng. Trans., vol. i. pp. 250–267); Klaiber, *Die Neutestamentliche Lehre von der Sünde und Erlösung*, 1836, pp. 367–422; Knobel, *Leviticus*, pp. 339–414; Kurtz, *Alttest. Opfercultus* (translated in *Foreign Theological Library*), §§ 17–161; Kuper, *Das Priesterthum des A. B.*, pp. 90–192; Lowman, *Hebrew Ritual*, pp. 144–206; Marbach, "Das Blut, eine theologische Studie," *Hilgenfeld Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theologie*, 1866, vol. ii. p. 137, etc.; Neumann, "Die Opfer des Alten Bundes," *Deutsche Zeitschrift für christlich. Wissenschaft*, 1852, 1853, and 1857; Oehler, article "Opfercultus des A. T.," Herzog, vol. x., and *Theologie des A. T.* (translated in *Foreign Theological Library*), vol. i. §§ 120–141; Outram, *De Sacrificiis*, Dissert. i. cap. viii. xxii.; Schultz, *Alttest. Theologie*, ed. 4, pp. 337–340; Spencer, *De Legibus Hebræorum*, Book III. Dissert. ii.; Steudel, *Vorlesungen über die Theologie des Alten Testamentes*, 1840, pp. 296–333; Stöckl, *Liturgie und dogmatische Bedeutung der Alttest. Opfer, insbesondere in ihrem Verhältnisse zur Neutest. Opfertheorie*, 1848; Tholuck, *Das A. T. in N. T.* Pt. ii. § 3; Tractates, *Sebachim* and *Menachoth* in Talmud; and Wangemann, *Das Opfer nach Lehre das heil Schrift*, vol. i. pp. 148–400; the commentary upon Leviticus of Raschi, edited by Berliner, 1866, and Schlossberg's *Sifra*, 1862.

standpoint of material, the precedent of post-Mosaic times may be followed, according to which all sacrifices are divisible into two broad classes,—viz. those in the ritual of which there is an effusion of blood, and those where there is no such effusion. The latter class may be called the *Bloodless*, and the former the *Blood offerings;* or, as will be subsequently seen, the names may be adopted of "Sacrifices" (pure and simple), and "Sacrifices of Atonement." Each of these classes contained several varieties, which must be distinguished. We commence with the blood-sacrifices, the specific varieties of which may be named the *burnt-offerings, the peace-offerings, the sin-offerings, and the trespass-offerings.*

Burnt-offerings[1] were presented on behalf either of individuals or the nation. The individual offerings consisted in the case of the thriving of a spotless ox,[2] ram, or he-goat, and in the case of the poor of a turtle-dove or pigeon. The ritual for the presentation of birds was extremely simple. The priest nipped off the head, burnt it, and then, having taken out the crop and fæces and thrown them into the ash-pit, made an incision in the wings, and consumed the entire body by fire. A different ritual attended all other kinds of burnt-offering. The victim was brought to the altar by the offerer, who then forcibly[3] laid his hand upon the animal's head, and slaughtered it on the north side.[4] In the act of slaughtering, the blood was caught by the priest and swung against the four walls of the altar. The offerer then flayed the slaughtered animal,[5] divided it, cleansed the intestines and the lower

[1] See Appendix I. The laws of the burnt-offering are given in Lev. i.

[2] The several blemishes which rendered an animal an illegitimate offering are given, Lev. xxii. 19–25. Jewish tradition increased the varieties to seventy-three. According to tradition, also, every animal offered in sacrifice was examined from head to foot by a priest before it was allowed to proceed to the altar. See Reland, *Antiquitates Sacræ Vet. Heb.*, Book III. cap. i. § 11.

[3] The Hebrew word always applied to this act signifies more than "an imposition of hands;" it is *a resting, a leaning* of the hand.

[4] Philo is in error as to the Levitical prescriptions, if not as to the later practice in the Herodian Temple, when he says (*De Victimis*, cap. v.) that a priest performed the slaughtering. See Lev. i. 5, iii. 2, iv. 24, 29, 33, etc.; comp. Kennicott's variations in reading of Lev. iv. 29.

[5] In the Herodian Temple, a series of hooks, attached by wooden supports to stone pillars, were employed in the process of flaying; when these hooks were

parts of the legs; whereupon the officiating priest, appropriating the skin, placed the severed parts with the head and fat in order upon the wood which had been previously arranged upon the ever-burning fire, and the whole sacrifice rose "as an offering of fire of a sweet odour unto Jehovah." If the burnt-offering consisted either of large or small cattle, it was ordained that after the entry into Canaan a meat-offering should follow it.[1] A further feature of importance was, that non-Israelites, who were rigidly excluded from other sacrificings, might present burnt-offerings.[2]

As varieties of the individual burnt-offerings, the several burnt-offerings may be mentioned which, as previously described, were presented as means of purification, those which were presented at the priestly and high-priestly consecrations, and those made at the release of the Nazarites from their vows, none of which call for more detailed notice at present.

Peace-offerings[3] were social rather than national or individual offerings; for, although they were presented by individuals, they were only consummated by the feast at which families or parties of friends assisted. They consisted of large and small cattle of both sexes, the male, however, having the pre-eminence. The ritual in part resembled and in part differed from that of the burnt-offering. The victim having been brought to the altar, the offerer laid his hand upon its head, slaughtered it (but apparently not on the north side[4]),—the priest meanwhile catching the blood and sprinkling it upon the altar,—flayed, divided, and cleansed it. The course subsequently followed was essentially different from that employed for the burnt-offering. Instead of consuming the animal entire, the offerer detached all the separable portions of fat, such as the flare, and that in which the intestines, kidneys, and liver are embedded, and in the case of sheep

insufficient, as at the Passover, the carcases were suspended upon staves placed across the shoulders of two men.

[1] Num. xv. 1–12. [2] Lev. xvii. 8, xxii. 18, 25.

[3] The laws of the peace-offering are given in Lev. iii. and vii. 11–36.

[4] Nothing is said on this matter in Leviticus, although the burnt and sin offerings are expressly commanded to be slain upon the north side. Kalisch, *Leviticus*, A. X. 3, quotes a questionable rule from the *Mishna*, that the most holy offerings were killed on the north side, and the less holy in any part of the court.

severed the fat tail;[1] these portions were then burnt with the daily burnt-offering. The breast was afterwards "waved" by a kind of horizontal movement and given to the Aaronites, and the right leg was lifted or "heaved" off as a gift to the officiating priest. The remains of the carcase were carried away by the offerer, and a meal made of it for himself and his household, which was partaken of in the sacred precincts of the Tabernacle. Meat and drink offerings also accompanied this form of sacrifice, one of the cakes of the meat-offering always falling to the priest.[2]

The thank-offerings, votive-offerings, and voluntary-offerings were varieties of the peace-offerings.[3]

Sin-offerings,[4] like burnt-offerings, were offered on behalf of individuals and on behalf of the nation—the national sin-offerings being presented on feast-days, and being more appropriately described under that head. The individual sin-offerings varied in ceremonial according to the status of the persons presenting them. If the high priest sinned in his official position, he was to offer an ox without blemish. Having performed the presentations, the imposition of hands, and the slaughtering in the customary manner, he took a part of the blood into the Tabernacle, and sprinkled it seven times "in the face of the veil of the Holy;" and having put some of the blood upon the horns of the altar of incense, he poured out the remainder at the bottom of the altar of burnt-offering; the same fatty portions which were removed in the case of the peace-offerings were afterwards lifted off the carcase and consumed above the daily burnt-offering, the

[1] "In modern Palestine all the sheep are of the broad-tailed species. The broad part of the tail is an excrescence of fat, from which the true tail hangs down."—Robinson, *Palestine*, vol. ii. p. 166.

[2] Lev. vii. 12–14; Num. xv. 3–12. It would appear, from a variety of rabbinic testimony, that in later times this order of ritual above described was not adopted in every peace-offering. In the peace-offerings of private persons, the imposition of hands was followed by the slaughtering, and this by the ceremonial of waving. In the public peace-offerings the imposition of hands was omitted, and the waving took place both before and after the slaughtering. In the sacrifice of the restored leper, the imposition of hands was followed first by the waving and then by the slaughtering.

[3] See Appendix I.

[4] The laws of the sin-offering are given, Lev. iv.

high priest carrying the rest of the carcase to a clean place before the camp, and burning it on wood with fire. In the case of unconscious sin on the part of the whole congregation, the elders presented a young ox, which was manipulated as that for the high priest. When a ruler or common Israelite sinned through ignorance, he was ordered to bring, on becoming conscious of his fault, the ruler an immaculate he-goat, and the Israelite an immaculate shaggy she-goat; in both cases the offerer then went through the customary process of laying on the hand and slaying, upon which the priest, having collected the blood, smeared some upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, poured out the rest at the foot, and burnt the whole of the fat upon the hearth; the carcase fell to the priest. The sin-offerings were slain where the burnt-offerings were.[1] It is also noteworthy that, whilst many victims might be offered as a burnt-offering, the sin-offering might never consist of more animals than one.

Sin-offerings as well as burnt-offerings were presented in certain purifications, in the consecration of the priests and high priests, and in the sacrificial ceremony of the Nazarite.

The *asham*, or trespass-offerings,[2] formed a class quite distinct from the sin-offerings.[3] In the primary law upon the subject three groups of sins are mentioned as requiring these sacrifices, —namely, in the first place, any unconscious negligence in presenting the gifts due to Jehovah, such as sacrifices, tithes, or first-fruits; secondly, any unintentional infringement of a divine command; and, thirdly, any deceitful violation of the rights of property, which, notwithstanding the fact that by the nature of the case it could not be unintentional, "would have proved," had no forgiveness been possible for it, "too

[1] Lev. vi. 25.

[2] The laws of the trespass-offerings are given in Lev. v. 14, etc., and vi. 1-7. Also compare the articles by Riehm and Rink, "Ueber das Schuldopfer," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* for 1854 and 1855.

[3] Considerable controversy has arisen upon the difference between the sin and trespass offering. That they are different (although the Hebrew names for each are etymologically synonymous) is shown by the facts that each has a distinct ritual, that sin-offerings were made without trespass-offerings, trespass without sin offerings, and both were made together. The difference will, however, be more conveniently studied in our next chapter.

rigorous for human frailty and imperfection."[1] In all cases the offering consisted of a ram, the blood of which, after the customary presentation, imposition of hands,[2] and slaughtering, instead of being smeared upon the horns of the altar, or taken into the Holy Place like the blood of the sin-offerings, was simply swung against the side of the altar,—the ritual being thenceforth the same as for the sin-offering either of a ruler or a common Israelite. This class of sacrifice was always accompanied by a recompense, which was considered as due to God and man: the discharge of the debt to God being effected by the placing by the priest of a fancy value upon the offered ram equivalent to the wrong done; and the human liability being discharged by the payment to the party wronged of the whole amount of the fraud, *increased by a retributory fifth.*

Trespass-offerings were offered under certain conditions by the Nazarite and the restored leper.

Among *the bloodless sacrifices*,[3] the meat-offerings,[4] as they have been called in the Authorized Version, took a prominent place. They were the Levitical vegetable sacrifices, and were offered either on behalf of individuals or the nation. They consisted of fine wheaten flour, or of cakes of the same, variously prepared with oil, according to the culinary arts of the Jews, some being baked in a small oven like the Arab's *tannur*, some being prepared on plates, and some in a skillet; they also occasionally consisted of roasted ears of corn. To all these "meat-offerings" oil and salt were added, and to those which consisted of flour or grain incense also. The fruits of trees—such as almonds, pomegranates, dates or figs, any, in fact, upon which continuous labour was not expended in cultivation—were strictly forbidden to be presented, as was any

[1] Fairbairn, *Typology*, vol. ii. p. 345.

[2] Such, at any rate, is the conclusion from the analogy of the Mosaic animal sacrifices; nevertheless, no command is given respecting the laying on of hands in connection with the trespass-offering.

[3] A large amount of information concerning the bloodless sacrifices of Mosaism may be gathered from Thalhofer's Prize Essay, *Die unblutigen Opfer des mosaischen Cultus*, 1848; however, it is written, it should be stated, in the Roman Catholic interest.

[4] See Appendix I.

admixture of honey or vinegar. The ritual of presentation was very simple. The offerer brought the offering to the priest, who took a handful of the meal and oil with the incense, and burnt them on the altar, the remainder falling to the priest as "a thing most holy." On some exceptional days, such as Sabbaths and feast-days, the whole of the offering was burnt. Sometimes a drink-offering of wine, or of some strong intoxicating liquor called *shechar*,[1] was added without any special ritual. Let it be noted that the meat-offering was always preceded by some blood sacrifice, with two exceptions, —viz., the daily offering of the high priest, and that offering which was substituted for the blood sacrifice in the case of the poor.[2]

The offerings of shew-bread, incense, and oil for the Holy Place were also important bloodless sacrifices. The striking name of the shew-bread or face-bread was derived from the command, "Thou shalt lay upon the table face-bread before My face continually."[3] This bread[4] consisted of twelve loaves according to the number of the tribes of Israel, which were laid upon the table in the Holy Place on a Sabbath and renewed the following Sabbath, those which were removed being assigned to the priests, who were required to eat them in a holy place. The offering of oil[5] was an offering of the purest olive oil, with which the high priest replenished the golden candlestick every day; and the offering of incense,[6] the special incense which was burnt on its appropriate altar every morning and every evening.

Other varieties of bloodless sacrifices were the redemption moneys of five shekels a-piece for every Israelite except the Levites,[7] the free-will offerings for the construction and maintenance of the Tabernacle and for the vestments of the priesthood,[8] the wood-offerings which were made after the arrival in Canaan,[9] the tithes,[10] the firstlings of fruits, cattle,

[1] Kalisch, *Leviticus*, Essay A. § 8, B. 7.
[2] See Lev. v. 11.
[3] Ex. xv. 30 (Heb.).
[4] Lev. xxiv. 5–9.
[5] Ex. xxvii. 20, 21; Lev. xxiv. 2.
[6] Ex. xxx. 7, 8, 34–38.
[7] Num. iii. 47–51.
[8] Ex. xxxv. 20–29.
[9] Neh. x. 34, xiii. 31. From these statements it would appear that the presentation of the necessary fuel for the altar was a customary offering.
[10] Lev. xxvii. 30–33; Num. xviii. 21–32.

and men,[1] the oblations of spoils taken in battle,[2] and the several exceptional vows[3] of self, house, cattle, or land which were solemnly and voluntarily made to God. Quite in harmony with the Mosaic conception of Sacrifice, Ewald[4] speaks of the Sabbath, or sacrifice of rest, and the corporeal sacrifices of circumcision, the vow of the Nazarite, and fasts. To describe these bloodless sacrifices more minutely would fill many pages, and would not advance our general inquiry.

In the classification of the sacrificial injunctions from the standpoint of the offerers, there is a threefold division. According to the injunctions of the Law, there were *national* sacrifices, there were *official* sacrifices, and there were *individual* sacrifices, the nation, the official, and the layman each owing any position of religious privilege to sacrificial observances.

For there were express *national* acts of sacrificial worship according to the Mosaic law. As such, the nation was supposed capable of collective humiliation and confession, of collective atonement and self-surrender. These national offerings consisted of what may be called the *serial* offerings, or those which were presented in the name of the nation daily, weekly, and monthly (to be described more fully presently); of what may be called the *festal* offerings, or the sacrificial ceremonial ordained for the holy days of the calendar (also to be further described presently); of the *several offerings for the service of the Holy Places* (the holy oil for the lamps, the incense, and the shew-bread); and of certain *extraordinary offerings*, instituted in response to a widespread sense whether of *thanksgiving or humiliation*.

Upon these last let a few additional words be said. They were offerings of singular interest. In these extraordinary offerings we see the general theory of Mosaic sacrifice put to new applications under waves of national sentiment. Amongst these abnormal but suggestive offerings were those made for the erection of the Tabernacle, its structure and its furniture, the offerings at the consecration of Aaron and his sons, the

[1] Ex. xxiii. 19; Lev. ii. 14, xxiii. 17; Num. xviii. 8–11.
[2] Num. xxxi. 48–54.
[3] Lev. xxvii.
[4] *Alterthümer*, pp. 109–143.

surrender by the Hebrew women of their brass mirrors for the manufacture of the brazen laver, and the sin-offerings presented by the congregation in acknowledgment of national sin. All such offerings show the nation acting rather upon the spirit than the letter of its laws, making trial of old ordinances, in new conditions, applying the injunctions given to novel circumstances, passing, so to speak, from the sphere of law to that of equity. Nor is it without its interest that, according to Rabbinic tradition, the nation was represented in all national sacrifices by permanent officials, who took part in the relative ceremonial in the nation's name.

The *official* acts of sacrifice pertained to the ecclesiastical and political heads of the nation.

Of the priestly offerings, the following enumeration is exhaustive. There were sin-offerings to be offered by the priest who had inadvertently erred in the discharge of the duties of his calling.[1] There was a meat-offering to be made by the high priest daily in the Holy Place, evening and morning.[2] There was the solemn and elaborate expiation of the great Day of Atonement for the entire priestly order. Lastly, at the consecration of any priest or Levite, characteristic offerings were enjoined, of varying price and varying ritual.

The offerings to be made by the heads of the State were as follows. There is express mention of offerings made "by the princes of Israel, heads of the house of their fathers," at the dedication of the Tabernacle.[3] There was a specific sin-offering for a ruler, whether he was judge or king.[4] And it would appear, from the later offerings of David and Solomon and others on set occasions, that these official offerings recorded in the Law were regarded in the light of precedents.

Upon the *individual* sacrifices little need be said. Minute attention is paid to the religious needs of the individual Jew in the Law; and these personal sacrifices consisted, in due season, of all the varieties of blood and bloodless offerings,—sin-offerings and trespass-offerings, burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, meat-offerings and tithes, ransoms and firstlings,

[1] Lev. iv. 3.
[2] Lev. vi. 20.
[3] Num. vii. 10–89.
[4] Lev. iv. 22–26.

associating absolution, confession, and adoration with all the phases and grades of the national life. If the tribe of Levi sanctified itself by holy service in sacrifice, if the prince sanctified his government and the elders their nation in the same way, by the same means the farmer sanctified his toil, the mother her child, the citizen his skill, the singer his talent, and the prophet his calling. Further, the Law also enjoined certain specific adaptations of the regular sacrificial ritual, in order to expressly connect certain individual states of mind and body with the organized worship of the central sanctuary. As we have seen, these exceptional occasions which demanded an individual sacrifice of a specific kind, were—upon contact with a corpse,[1] upon the cure of a leper,[2] after parturition,[3] and after the cessation of derangement of the sexual organs.[4] An individual sacrifice of a special kind also attached to the vow of the Nazarite, its infringement and expiry.[5] The so-called trial of jealousy, too, was an individual sacrificial test of conjugal fidelity.[6]

The fifth class of Levitical injunctions treats of the Sacrificial Times and Seasons.[7]

The Jewish ecclesiastical year consisted, so to speak, of ordinary and extraordinary days, or, to adopt the distinction of the English Prayer-book, of common and holy days. These extraordinary or holy days were the seventh-days or Sabbaths, the first days in each month or the New-moons, the Feast of Trumpets and the Day of Atonement on the first and tenth

[1] Num. xix. [2] Lev. xiv. [3] Lev. xii.
[4] Lev. xv. [5] Num. vi. 13–21. [6] Num. v. 11–31.

[7] Compare Bähr, *Symbolik*, ed. 1, vol. ii. pp. 525-698 ; Ewald, *Alterthümer*, pp. 468–488 ; Fairbairn, *Typology*, vol. ii. pp. 434–464 ; Keil, *Archäologie*, vol. i. pp. 345–418 (Eng. Trans. vol. i. pp. 468–482, vol. ii. pp. 1–61) ; Hupfeld, "De primitiva et vera festorum apud Hebræos ratione ex legum Mosaicarum varietate eruenda," *Osterprogramm*, 1852 ; Kurtz, *Alttest. Opfercultus* (translated in *Foreign Theological Library*), §§ 174–213, pp. 295–361 ; Leyrer, article "Zahlen bei den Hebräern," Herzog, vol. xviii. ; Meyer, *De Temporibus Sacris et Festis Diebus Hebræorum*, 1724 ; Oehler, articles "Feste der alten Hebräer" (revised by Delitzsch in Herzog and Plitt, vol. iv.), and "Versöhnungstag" (re-written by Orelli in Herzog and Plitt, vol. xvi.), Herzog, vols. iv. and xvii. ; and *Theologie des Alt. Test.* vol. i. (translated in *Foreign Theological Library*), §§ 144–156 ; Schultz, *Alttest. Theologie*, ed. 4, pp. 327–336 ; and Wangemann, *Das Opfer nach Lehre der H. S.*, vol. ii. pp. 159–189.

days of the seventh month respectively, and the three annual festivals,—viz., the Feast of Unleavened Bread, which commenced on the fourteenth day of the first month with the Passover,[1] lasting seven days; the Feast of Harvest or First-fruits, or Weeks, or Pentecost, which was celebrated on the fiftieth day from the day of the Passover;[2] and the Feast of Tabernacles,[3] or Ingathering, which was observed on the fifteenth and the seven following days of the seventh month. Lengthy descriptions of these holy days are not called for; the reader is referred to the twenty-third chapter of Leviticus.

What it is of especial importance to our inquiry to observe, is that these several ordinary and extraordinary ecclesiastical days were celebrated amongst other methods by special and appropriate sacrificings. The whole year round, evening and morning, a burnt-offering was made of a lamb, accompanied by a meat-offering of meal and oil, and a drink-offering of wine; the whole year round a sacrifice was also daily offered of incense and of meal by the high priest. On the Sabbath days the evening and morning burnt-offerings were doubled. In the beginning of the months, or New-moons, on the seven days of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, on the Day of the First-fruits, and on the Feast of Trumpets, and the Day of Atonement (of course in addition to the daily and monthly oblations), sacrifices were made of two young bullocks, one ram, and seven lambs as a burnt-offering, with proportional meat-offerings and drink-offerings, and of a goat as a sin-offering. On the day of the Passover the only additional ritual was that of the paschal kid or lamb, which, having been selected four days previously, was killed in legal form at the altar of burnt-offering, immediately roasted without breaking a bone, and eaten with unleavened bread and bitter herbs; no stranger was allowed to participate without sub-

[1] For the institution of Passover and rules for its observance, see Ex. xii., xiii. 3–10, xxxiv. 18–21; Lev. xxiii. 4–8; Num. ix. 1–14, xxviii. 16–25; Deut. xvi. 1–8.

[2] For the institution of Pentecost and rules for its observance, see Lev. xxiii. 15–21; Num. xxviii. 26–31; Deut. xvi. 9–12.

[3] For the institution of Feast of Tabernacles and rules for its observance, see Ex. xxiii. 16; Lev. xxiii. 34–43; Num. xxix. 12–38; Deut. xvi. 13–16, xxxi. 10–13.

mission to the rite of circumcision.[1] At the Feast of Tabernacles there was a great peculiarity in the prescribed ritual: as on the other feast-days, a goat was offered as a sin-offering, but as regards the burnt-offering the number of rams and lambs was doubled, being two and fourteen instead of one and seven; whilst, instead of the two young bullocks of other feast-days, seventy were offered in all during the feast, these being so distributed that on the last day seven were slain, eight on the day previous, nine on the day preceding that, and so on, daily increasing until the number reached thirteen, the proportion slaughtered on the first day of the feast. There only now remains the ceremony of the Day of Atonement,[2] a detailed description of which will make the statement of the sacrificial times and seasons complete. The law concerning the Day of Atonement contains instruction as to the performance of the appropriate ritual, and as to its performance annually. The prescribed ritual was as follows: As a sacrifice for the priesthood, the high priest was to bring a sin-offering of a bullock and a burnt-offering of a ram; and as a sacrifice for the congregation, a sin-offering of two he-goats and a burnt-offering of a ram. The priest was to be clothed not in his state costume, but in one entirely of white, to be put on after bathing the whole body, and not simply the hands and feet as customarily. This dress of white was not even the plain official dress of the ordinary priesthood, for that had a coloured girdle. Lots were then cast upon the two he-goats, one lot for Jehovah and one for Azazel;[3] and according as the lots fell, so were they presented as living sacrifices before the altar. The ceremony of the expiation of the priesthood and the holy places then commenced. The bullock having been slain as a sin-offering for himself and his house, the high priest filled the censer with embers from the altar of burnt-offering and with incense, and placed the censer within the veil. Some of the blood of the ox was then sprinkled upon the mercy-seat, and seven times upon the ground. Atonement was afterwards made for the nation. The he-goat was slain, and its blood having been taken into the Holiest, was sprinkled as the blood of the ox had previously

[1] Ex. xii. 48. [2] Lev. xvi. [3] On Azazel, see Appendix II.

been. The floor of the Holy Place was next sprinkled with blood, and the altars of incense and burnt-offering. The expiation of the priesthood, Tabernacle, and nation being now performed, an exquisitely symbolic act of forgiveness was gone through. The high priest placed both his hands upon the head of the live goat, confessed over it all the sins and transgressions of the people, and sent it away by a man who was standing ready into the desert. The high priest then removed his whole garments, purified himself at the laver, and having donned his official robes, offered the burnt-offerings for himself and the people.

From the lengthy series of injunctions which have now been classified, it will be readily seen how laborious, protracted and intricate a system was this Mosaic *worship by presentation*. Yet how imposing! No religious ritual of ancient or modern times has appealed more forcibly to the eye or the imagination. It was a stirring and suggestive sight, beyond all question, which greeted such an one as a Levite, as he stood in early morning within the court of the Tabernacle ready to perform those more menial offices to which he had been appointed. Around him ran the white curtains of the sacred enclosure, relieved at regular intervals by the dull gold of the copper uprights and the gleam of the silver capitals. A few paces from where he watches, the more favoured members of his tribe, bearded, clad in their priestly robes of white and their parti-coloured girdles, are standing barefoot near the altar of burnt-offering, on the hearth of which the remnants of last night's sacrifice are still burning, or possibly purifying themselves at the laver in preparation for their sacred duties. The lamb for the morning sacrifice is slain and burnt before his eyes; and, a few moments afterwards, the high priest, in his official robes of white and blue, "Holiness to the Lord" glistening in gold upon his fair mitre, the jewelled breastplate flashing in the sun, is passing to the Holy Place, the golden bells and pomegranates at the fringe of his tunic ringing as he goes. Perhaps, as holy hands draw aside the curtain of the sanctuary, a glimpse is caught of the consecrated space within, lit by the golden candlestick and hazy with incense

from the golden altar; or, if the interior is sealed, there nevertheless is the tent of Jehovah, its gorgeous parti-coloured curtain in full view, and its immediate covering of blue and gold and scarlet and purple worked upon white, with cherubim, just visible beneath the outer awnings; and the onlooker knew that within, not far from the Ark and the mercy-seat and the shechinah, which were hidden behind the veil, the high priest was performing divine service, and meeting with Jehovah under exceptional privileges. As private members of the chosen race come streaming in with their offerings, the more active duties of the day begin. At one time, one who has inadvertently broken some commandment of the law is watching the blood of the sin-offering, which he has just brought and killed with his own hand, as it is smeared in atonement upon the horns of the altar; at another, the priest is listening over the head of a ram to a confession of fraud, and computing the amount of monetary indemnity to be paid. Now a Hebrew woman, but recently a mother, is modestly presenting herself with her offering of pigeons; and now the high priest is passing through the gate of the court, attended by a Levite carrying birds and scarlet wool and hyssop,—he has been summoned without the camp to examine a restored leper. Anon an application is made for the means of purifying some tent where the dead is lying. Here, in joyful recognition of the divine favour, a solitary worshipper is presenting a burnt-offering; there, recumbent upon the holy soil, a whole family are merrily partaking of the remains of a peace-offering. At one hour, a householder is compounding for the property which he has voluntarily vowed unto the Lord; the next, a Nazarite, with unshorn hair and beard, is presenting the prescribed sacrifices for release from his vow. Possibly, as the day advances, a consecration to the priesthood is impressively performed. And these and other ceremonies are maintained the whole year round. As the Jewish calendar ran its course in those times, exceptional, alas, when the religious sense of the nation was quick and its practice scrupulous, it was as if one long bleat, one incessant lowing, filled the air; it was as if one continuous stream of sacrificial blood choked the runnels of the Court. The year opened with the evening

sacrifice and the New-moon celebration, the expiring flames of which were fed next day by the ordinary morning sacrifice and by a round of individual presentations, which must sometimes have known no interruption until the smoke of the evening sacrifice again rose into the air and another day began. Day after day the customary ceremonial was repeated, till the Sabbath twilight fell and double sacrifices were slaughtered. On the fourteenth day of the first month came the solemn celebration of the Passover, when in every home, with devout recollections and enthusiastic hopes, a paschal lamb was spread upon the board. Then followed the seven days of Unleavened Bread, with their customary and holy-day ritual, bringing at length, after the repeated diurnal, sabbatic, and mensual formalities, the fuller slaughter of Pentecost. Day after day, Sabbath after Sabbath, New-moon after New-moon, the authorized worship was again continued, until there came a break to the monotony once more on the first day of the seventh month in the Feast of Trumpets, and on the tenth day of the same month in the awful and grave procedure of the Day of Atonement, followed after five days' interval by the singular and more grateful worship of the Feast of Tabernacles. The year was afterwards brought to a close by the common series of daily, weekly, and monthly effusions of blood.

Such was the Levitical calendar of sacrifice. It is of manifest interest, because it was divinely enjoined. Can we interpret the revelation ?

CHAPTER II.

THE ESSENTIAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MOSAIC INJUNCTIONS.

"Der symbolische Cultus im Ganzen und Einzelnen solche Ideen und Wahrheiten darstellen müsse, welche mit den anerkannten und auch sonst klar ausgesprochenen Principien des Mosaismus übereinstimmen."—BAEHR, *Symbolik des mosaischen Cultus*, ed. 1, vol. i. p. 47.

NOW the question arises, what significance these injunctions, so varied, so curious, so difficult, so minute, which have been analyzed and classified in the preceding chapter, can have had for the pious Israelite, who, not content with an unintelligent obedience, endeavoured to comprehend the purpose of this divinely-revealed rubric. Had the wheels of time rolled backward, and in a freak of mockery at human advance, substituted an elaborate materialism for the simple and semi-spiritual worship of his ancestors? Were those higher aspirations which ever and anon came into his soul, welcome, yet unsought, to be clipped by endless compulsory observances of forms and ceremonies? Was divine worship to be henceforth a fashion of dress and a variety of manual labour; his newly acquired revelation a gorgeous system of idolatry; the several sacrifices a slavish acquiescence in an *opus operatum?* Such thoughts, if not negatived by the Mosaic principles of the unity, providence, and spirituality of Jehovah, would be for ever set at rest by the express teaching of the Mosaic revelation itself, which, by clearly announcing the doctrinal significance of certain leading features of the Levitical cultus, gave some satisfactory reply to the questioning *quo tendit* of its adherents.

That the Mosaic ceremonial, if we accept the genius of the Pentateuch, must have had some immediate reference to the religious life of the chosen people, and that that ceremonial in

no way countenanced the magical rites of heathenism, are propositions which must be accepted by the Biblical Theologian. It is contrary to the whole teaching of the Pentateuch that (as a Rationalist has maintained) incense was offered with sacrifices to keep off flies, and the dress of the priesthood was of white linen because it would wash easily. Is it not equally at variance with the Mosaic revelation that the prescribed rites were but dumb types, which would only assume the power of speech many centuries later? Is it not an ignorant misrepresentation of the Levitical teaching, to say that "the Jew was simply the keeper of a casket which he could not unlock, an actor in a symbolic representation which to him conveyed little or no meaning"?[1] For more than sixteen hundred years before the declarations of Jesus were given to the world, the sacrificial ritual described in the preceding chapter was the only authorized Jewish worship, the one divine reply to the cravings of the spiritual nature of the Israelites; and it must be conceded that it is the express teaching of the Books of Moses, that the word of the Law as well as that of Prophecy "always had its twofold use, to instruct by its promulgation as well as its accomplishment."[2]

At the very threshold, therefore, of our inquiry into the significance of the Mosaic sacrifices, it will be of considerable moment, before attempting to investigate in any way the deep-seated symbolism and the far-reaching typical allusions which must be subsequently studied, that we ascertain the direct statements of the Torah, or the Books of the Law, concerning the doctrinal significance of its sacrificial injunctions. This, which may be called the *essential* significance of the Mosaic injunctions, will be best deduced, according to the method of the preceding chapter, from an examination, in the first place, of the several divisions of the cultus, and, secondly, of the cultus in its totality.

[1] Litton, *The Mosaic Dispensation*, p. 77. In such words Litton aptly expresses the import of the common typical theory of Mosaism; his own view is different.

[2] Davison, *On Prophecy*, 6th ed. p. 70. Davison, however, has missed this truth and dwelt upon the reserve which he believes the law maintains respecting the meaning of its ordinances. See *On Prophecy*, pp. 139–150; *Primitive Sacrifice*, p. 89.

The essential significance of the Tabernacle may be inferred from the names customarily given to it. These names may be divided into three classes,—viz. in the first place, those which, like *house*,[1] *tent*,[2] *dwelling*,[3] *dwelling of the testimony*,[4] convey the general idea of a place of divine residence; secondly, those which, like *tent of meeting*[5] or *tent-house of meeting*,[6] express the idea of a meeting-place for God and man; and, thirdly, those which, like *sanctuary*,[7] draw attention to holiness as an attribute of the place itself. As examples of the first class, the following passages may be taken:—"The first of the first-fruits of thy land thou shalt bring into the *house* of the Lord thy God;"[8] "According to all that I show thee, after the pattern of the *dwelling*;"[9] "And thou shalt make a hanging for the door of the *tent*;"[10] "This is the sum of the *dwelling*, *the dwelling of the testimony*."[11] As examples of the second class, these may suffice:—"*In the tent of assembly*" (Auth. Ver., in the tabernacle of the congregation) "without the veil, which is before the testimony, Aaron and his sons shall order it from evening to morning before the Lord;"[12] and, "Thus was all the work of the *tent-house of the assembly*" (Auth. Ver., *tabernacle of the tent of the congregation*) "finished."[13] The divine command, "Let them make me a *sanctuary*, that I may dwell among them,"[14] will illustrate the third class. Now a house where God was, or was to be supposed to be, must be a place for worship, and a place for divine worship must of necessity be holy ground; thus one fundamental idea lay at the root of all these appellations, viz. that the Tabernacle was a meeting-place between Jehovah and His covenant people. There Jehovah was to be thought peculiarly present, and therefore peculiarly approachable. By the Jew the Lord God Almighty was not to be sought in woods or fountains or valleys, but in

[1] Heb. *bayith*.
[2] Heb. *ohel*, translated in Authorized Version as *tabernacle* or *tent*.
[3] Heb. *mishkan*, from the root *shakan*, to lie down, and hence to dwell, translated in Authorized Version by *tabernacle*, but more accurately rendered by *habitation* or *abode*.
[4] Heb. *mishkan haeduth*.
[5] Heb. *ohel moed*.
[6] Heb. *mishkan ohel moed*.
[7] Heb. *miqdash*.
[8] Ex. xxiii. 19.
[9] Ex. xxv. 9.
[10] Ex. xxvi. 36.
[11] Ex. xxxviii. 21.
[12] Ex. xxvii. 21.
[13] Ex. xxxix. 32.
[14] Ex. xxv. 8.

this house which He had appointed. The holy places of Mosaism were a divine answer to the prayer of Job: "Oh that I knew where I might find Him, that I might come even to His seat!"[1] In a synagogue or in a church God is worshipped, and thus becomes present; in the Tabernacle, Jehovah was present in an exceptional manner, and therefore was worshipped.

The correctness of the inference that the Tabernacle was a divinely appointed place of meeting between Jehovah and the chosen nation, is borne out by the express words of the Pentateuch. "And there I will meet" are the words of the Lord at the ordinance of the perpetual burnt-offering at the door of the Tabernacle—"and there I will meet with the children of Israel, and the dwelling shall be sanctified by My glory. And I will sanctify the tent of meeting, and the altar: and I will sanctify also both Aaron and his sons, to minister to Me in the priest's office. And I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will be their God."[2]

But the injunctions classified in the preceding chapter remind us that the essential significance of the Tabernacle as a place of divine residence, and therefore as a place of meeting between God and man, must be qualified by a counter truth. Approach to Jehovah was conditioned by the terms of the Sinaitic revelation. Whilst, therefore, the Tabernacle as the dwelling-place of the Most High, was by the divine condescension a place where God and the Jew might come together, that contact was arranged in accordance with the characteristics of the Mosaic dispensation. The whole structure was a place of meeting where man and God could congregate; but it was in the Court only that the common Israelite could approach Jehovah, and that by mediation in the person of the appointed priestly representatives: in the Holy Place, to which the priests alone had access, the worshippers also approached the throne of Deity by mediation, being admitted, so to speak, to the anteroom of the divine audience-chamber by the adoration of their chief; whilst to the high priest alone, and that after solemn preparation, was it permitted on one day in the year to pass within the veil,

[1] Job xxiii. 3. [2] Ex. xxix. 42–45.

and gaze unhindered upon that mercy-seat, aglow with gold, where rested the shadowy cloud of the shechinah.

Further, if the Tabernacle was the appointed sanctuary where man might meet with God on the fulfilment of certain conditions, be it noted that the several altars were, so to speak, the points at which those conditions could be best fulfilled. Every square inch of the sacred enclosure was a place of meeting between Jehovah and His people, according to the terms of the divine revelation; but it was at the altar of burnt-offering in the court that the non-priestly worshippers approached most nearly to their God; it was at the golden altar in the Holy Place that the priests were admitted to closest access; and it was as he approached most directly the space beneath the outstretched wings of the cherubim, that the high priest drew nearest to the throne of intercession. The several altars were the shrines, so to speak, of the several sanctuaries, in which their essence was concentrated, and from which their power radiated.

The essential significance of the peculiar sanctuary of Judaism lay, then, according to the testimony of the Pentateuch itself, in the fact that, being the visible dwelling-place of Jehovah, it testified to the possibility of human approach to God, so long as the conditions of the related laws were observed, — these conditions being, so far at least as the theocratic status of the worshippers was concerned, that the Israelite might come near to God in the person of His priests in the Court, and especially at the altar of burnt-offering; that in the Holy Place, and especially at the altar of incense, the priesthood might do homage to Jehovah as enshrined behind the veil; and that in the Holy of Holies, and especially at the high altar of the mercy-seat, the high priest might, by careful obedience to the prescribed conditions, occasionally regard that cloud by which the Almighty condescended to reveal and at the same time to conceal His presence.[1]

[1] Only a cursory allusion needs be made to those other meanings of the Tabernacle which have been advocated with insufficient deference to the statements of the Pentateuch. Philo, Josephus, and many of the Jewish Rabbis and Christian Fathers regarded the Tabernacle as a pattern of the universe; Luther, as a likeness of man as created in the divine image; Maimonides, and many of the later Rabbis (who have been followed by Spencer), as a royal palace. Each

In the words which were first addressed to Moses from Sinai, the significant promise was made by the Most High, that the whole people should be "a kingdom of priests;"[1] and when subsequently, in merciful consideration of the sense of unfitness and fear aroused by the voice from the Mount as of a trumpet and thunder, the promise was fulfilled in a modified form, and the tribe of Levi was consecrated for divine service, the Aaronites were selected to be "priests." Now, what was the essential significance of this promise so made and so fulfilled?

The essential significance of the priesthood cannot be deduced from the etymology of the Hebrew word thus translated, since that is not clear;[2] nor is the extra-Levitical usage of the word so restricted as to afford an unequivocal solution of the question. A direct declaration of the Mosaic conception is, however, given in connection with the Korahitic rebellion,[3] which really hinged upon a dispute as to the very point

of these opinions has found its modern advocates. The view that the Tabernacle received its significance from the fact that it was, as it were, a royal residence or palace for the King of kings, has been asserted with much illustration by Hofmann, *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, vol. i. p. 139. Luther's singular interpretation has been defended at considerable length by Friederich, *Symbolik des mos. Stiftshütte*, who has not shrunk from finding in the Court, Holy Place, and Holiest, representations of the human body, soul, and spirit; and in the wooden framework and its coverings, the bony skeleton with its flesh and skin. Then the opinion that the Tabernacle symbolized the heavens above and the earth beneath has been expounded with great learning and acumen by Dr. Bähr. Another view, equally unwarranted by Scripture, was advanced by Hengstenberg, *Beiträge zur Einl. in's A. T.*, vol. iii. pp. 628–652 (who has been followed by Keil, *Archäologie*, vol. i. pp. 94–98 (Eng. Trans., vol. i. pp. 152, etc.), and *Commentar, Exodus* (translated in *Foreign Theological Library*); Knobel, *Exodus*, p. 249; Kurtz, *Studien und Kritiken*, 1844, p. 315; and Tholuck, *Commentar zum Hebräerbrief*, ed. 2, p. 312), that the Tabernacle symbolized the Jewish theocracy. It should be added that Bähr had already modified his views in his work upon the Temple (*Der Salomonische Tempel*), and that in his second edition he adheres on scriptural grounds to the view given in the text.

[1] Ex. xix. 7.

[2] See a valuable note by Kalisch, for example, on the significance of *kohen* in the unabridged edition of his *Commentary on Leviticus*, vol. i. pp. 559, 560, in which he classifies the several etymologies, Arabic and Hebrew, which give as meanings—(1) interpreter or representative, (2) soothsayer, (3) administrator or servant, (4) prince or noble, (5) one who is near God, (6) an assistant, and (7) one who bends or makes genuflexions.

[3] Num. xvi.

before us: "Now Korah, the son of Izhar, the son of Kohath, the son of Levi, and Dathan and Abiram, the sons of Eliab, and On, the son of Peleth, sons of Reuben, took men, and rose up before Moses with certain of the children of Israel, two hundred and fifty princes of the assembly, famous in the congregation, men of renown; and they gathered themselves together against Moses and against Aaron, and said unto them, Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy, every one of them, and the Lord is among them; wherefore, then, lift ye up yourselves above the congregation of the Lord?" From these words, and the question afterwards asked by Moses ("Seek ye the priesthood also?"), it will be seen that the marks of a valid priesthood recognised by the rebels were,—first, that holiness possessed by the nation in common; and, secondly, that privilege of divine access which the whole nation shared. With what correctness the sequel shows: "And when Moses heard, he fell on his face; and he spake unto Korah and unto all his company, saying, Even to-morrow the Lord will show who are His and who is holy; and will cause him to come near unto Him: even him whom He hath chosen will He cause to come near unto Him." In other words, Moses said: "You arrogate the higher honours of the priesthood; to-morrow the Lord Himself will decide upon the justice of your claim." It is unnecessary for our purpose to continue the narrative; in this important passage the *notes* of the priesthood are given by Moses himself. Four attributes are here advanced as those of a valid appointment -namely, a divine choice or call ("whom He hath chosen"), a right of divine service ("who are His"), holiness ("who is holy"), and a right of divine access ("come near unto Him"); the priest was one who, having been divinely selected, had accepted his call without reservation, and being possessor of an imputed righteousness, was privileged to draw near the Majesty from on High. A closer analysis might still further simplify this Mosaic conception of priesthood. Of the attributes just enumerated, it may without misunderstanding be said that the second, the right of divine service, and the fourth, the right of divine access, are identical; then the first and the third, the holy character and the divine election, rather belong to the

prerequisites of priesthood than to its essence. The essential significance, therefore, of the priesthood, may be stated to lie in its privilege of divine approach.[1] It will thus be seen that in a limited degree every Jew was, as the primary form of the Covenant announced, a priest; nevertheless the right of divine approach, restricted as it was to the court of the Tabernacle, was so meagre as to be unworthy of the name of priesthood. It was to the Aaronites, with their more tangible privileges of worship before the veil, that the name seemed more especially applicable; whilst to the officiating high priest alone was it permitted to occasionally enter within the veil and participate in that highest access, in that most exalted priesthood, which was possible to Judaism. Guarded by so many restrictions, and rising through such gradations, how lofty the dignity, how sublime the privilege, of standing in the presence of the Holy One of Israel to worship and petition!

The essential significance of the priesthood may be otherwise stated. For, if it be remembered that the privilege of divine approach carried with it the privilege of representing others to whom such approach was denied, it may be said that the essence of the priesthood was *mediation*, that of the ordinary priests being indirect, and that of the high priest direct. Again, the essential attribute of the high priest, the privilege of access to the Holy of Holies, implying the purpose for which that access was made, the essence of the high-priesthood, may be roughly described, as in some passages of the New Testament, and in popular theology, by its exceptional privilege of atonement.

If we now inquire into the essential significance of the rites of purification, this will be easily arrived at when we have deduced the Mosaic conception of "uncleanness." Uncleanness, as we have seen in the previous chapter, arose from contact or association with a human or animal corpse, from the normal or abnormal action of the generative organs, from leprosy or association with a leper, and from certain offices

[1] Upon this essential significance of the priesthood there is comparative unanimity among the more recent expositors.

connected with the Day of Atonement and the slaughter of the red heifer, the ashes of which were employed in removing the contamination of death. Under one or other of these classes all the numerous rites of cleansing may be placed.

Now, the first characteristic which suggests itself upon a comparison of these several classes, is that "uncleanness" was not the immediate consequence of deliberate wrong-doing, but was, as far as the subject of it was concerned, *involuntary*, or at any rate so interwoven with the present constitution of things as almost to deserve the name of involuntary. For example, childbirth was in the nature of things; so were the other functions and disorders of the organs of reproduction. A man could not help it if leprosy attacked him. To minister to the dying and the dead must be the duty of some one. And as regards the marriage relations, it must be borne in mind that the ideal of the Jew was neither a virgin nor a childless life, but a life where children played upon the floor. The curious thing, then, about this Levitical "uncleanness," was that it was contracted in ways never declared by the Law to be flagitious: astonishment arises not that the predisposing acts or states were removed from the catalogue of sins, but that these several instances of "uncleanness" themselves should have rendered ineligible for divine worship. To be unclean was to become defiled not by deliberate wrong-doing, but in the course of nature.

Add to the fact that "uncleanness" resulted from the constitution of things, the further fact that it was incidental to those natural or ceremonial processes which, according to the Mosaic revelation, stood in most intimate connection with sin, and the Levitical conception of "uncleanness" has been wholly stated. "Uncleanness" was the remote, not the immediate, consequence of sin. Those who sinned with intent became parents of children who unintentionally sinned. In proof, the following examples may be cited. The several rites of cleansing were reducible, as we have seen, to four classes —those which concerned contact with the dead, the action of the generative functions, leprosy, and certain prominent sin-offerings. Of the last nothing needs be said, inasmuch as the scapegoat and the red cow were so manifestly regarded as the

bearers of human sin. Then as to leprosy, living death as it was, it was always considered by the Jew as an awful embodiment of the very nature of sin, and bore that meaning the more evidently, inasmuch as the laws of leprosy all conduced to deepen such an impression. And as regards the contact of a corpse and the legal impurity of childbirth, had not the curse pronounced in Eden constituted an ever memorable precedent for regarding the accidents of birth and death as the appalling consequences of the Fall? The Levitical doctrine of uncleanness was, in fact, the Old Testament form of the doctrine of original sin, and uttered in pathetic forms of exclusion and isolation the truth that sin could not be approached by the innocent even without defilement. Ceremonial uncleanness was the Mosaic recognition of natural depravity.[1]

Defining their legal uncleanness as a state of unfitness for divine worship resulting not from criminality, but from certain natural and legal processes indirectly connected in the Mosaic revelation with crime, the essential significance of the rites of purification will be seen in the removal of "uncleanness." Legal purification was the divinely instituted method during the Old Testament dispensation for counteracting original sin.

[1] Very opposite views have been held concerning the ultimate significance of the Mosaic purifications—views resulting, for the most part, from the varying standpoints assumed by investigators. The Rationalists, for example, find in these Mosaic injunctions sanitary regulations simply,—*e.g.*, Michaelis, *Mosaisches Recht*, vol. iv. p. 220; Schmidt (J. J.), *Bibl. Medicus*, p. 653; Saalschütz, *Mosaisches Recht*, p. 217; and Maimonides and Spencer; whilst some of the advocates of Comparative Religion see in these purifications ecclesiastical methods of obtaining influence (see Gramberg, *Religionsideen*, vol. i. p. 364). Nor has there been unanimity amongst those who have adopted the biblico-theological standpoint. Bähr regards these purifications as attached to the commencement and end of this mortal life, which is thus contrasted with the immortal life that is absolutely holy (*Symbolik*, vol. ii. p. 459); but such a theory leaves unexplained some of the facts of the case, and explains others falsely. How, on such a theory, can the uncleanness of involuntary seminal emission be explained? and how is it, on such a theory, that it is the mother and not the new-born babe that is unclean? Sommer, *Bibl. Abhandlungen*, vol. i. p. 201, first clearly enunciated the view stated in the text; and he has been followed by Keil, *Archäologie*, vol. i. p. 277 (Eng. Transl., vol. i. p. 378), Kurtz, *Alttest. Opfercultus*, § 2137, Leyrer, article "Reinigungen" in Herzog, vol. xii. p. 629, König, article "Reinigungen" in Herzog and Plitt, vol. xii. p. 617, and rn, *Typology*, vol. ii. p. 420.

At the root of the essential significance of the Mosaic sacrifices two ideas lie,—viz. the Mosaic idea of *presentation*, and that of *atonement*.

Upon the idea of *presentation* (or *giving to God*, as it has been otherwise termed), the fundamental idea of all sacrifice, little additional needs be said after the exposition in the introduction and in the chapters on the patriarchal doctrine. The Mosaic system of worship, like the patriarchal, was based upon the fact that man might approach God so long as his hands were not empty. As Adam worshipped in Eden by the surrender of time and strength in obedient performance of the divine will, and possibly by the presentation of some of the fruits of his labour, as Abel brought of the firstlings of his flock, the acceptance of his gift opening a way to God which the patriarchs were not slow to follow; so, in the law given upon Sinai, the Jew was bidden to come near his Maker and Preserver, gifts in hand. Offerings of toil became means of grace; things eloquent of cost were channels for what was priceless; pledges of human sincerity in appeal were transmuted into pledges of divine earnestness in reply; gifts from men to God brought gifts from God to men. From a study of the religious actions of mankind, presentation seems to be an instinctively adopted method of divine worship; but we have not to do with philosophical solutions: at any rate, worship by presentation was the prominent method of Mosaism.

Unlike the preceding idea, which belonged to every sacrifice of whatever name in some measure or other, the idea of *atonement*[1] belonged simply to sacrifices of blood, and a few analogous cases which will be more fully explained in our next chapter but one. This idea of atonement, never expressly alluded to in the pre-Mosaic ceremonial, although beyond a doubt everywhere latent, we must carefully extract from the Law,—our only instruments, of course, being the etymology and scriptural usage of the Hebrew original. They who would obtain the scriptural conception of the matter in hand by an analysis of *at-one-ment* or *attune-ment*, seem to forget that the Old Testament was not revealed in English.

[1] Compare Riehm, *Der Begriff der Sühne im Alten Test.*, 1877.

Now that process which has received the technical name of *atonement* is, as has been shown in our first Appendix, "a covering of sin," and a covering in such a way that God regards it as neutralized, disarmed, inoperative to arouse His anger. "To make an atonement," if we probe the Hebrew figure to the bottom, was to throw, so to speak, a veil over sin so dazzling that the veil and not the sin was visible, or to place side by side with sin something so attractive as to completely engross the eye. The figure which the New Testament uses when it speaks of the "new robe," the Old Testament uses when it speaks of "atonement." When an atonement was made under the Law, it was as though the divine eye, which had been kindled at the sight of sin and foulness, was quieted by the garment thrown around it; or, to use a figure much too modern, yet equally appropriate, it was as if the sinner who had been exposed to the lightning of the divine wrath had been suddenly wrapped round and insulated. The idea of atonement was the so covering the sinner that his sin was invisible or non-existent in the sense that it could no longer come between him and his Maker. To use the words of a German theologian: "When sinful souls approached the altar of God, where dwelt His Holiness, their sinful nature came between them and God, and atonement served the purpose of covering their sins, of cancelling the charges on which they were arraigned."[1] It should be stated that the effects of *atonement* are clearly stated to have been either forgiveness of sins or cleansing,—in other words, the forgiveness of sins whether contracted deliberately or unintentionally.

Now to every sacrifice the name of *gift* or *presentation* was applied,[2] and therefore in every sacrifice ordained by the Law, whether animal or bloodless, the idea of presentation—the approach to God by means of an offering, the approach to God with the visible representation of so much labour and thought—was contained. And in a large class of offerings, namely all those which had no element of effusion of blood, this was the leading idea. Symbolizing each in its appro-

[1] Küper, *Das Priesterthum des A. B.*, p. 120.
[2] See Appendix I.

priate way some religious fact, every bloodless sacrifice was at least a sacrifice—a gift by the presentation of which the offerer was permitted to approach the Most High. In this idea of presentation every meat-offering, every tithe, every cake of shew-bread, every pinch of salt, every hin of oil, had its ultimate significance.

Over and above the idea of a *gift*, to every sacrifice of animal life there was the idea of *atonement* superadded. This idea of atonement is deliberately associated with blood in one important passage in Leviticus:[1] "For the soul of the flesh is in the blood; and I" (the Lord) "have given it you upon the altar to be a covering over your souls: for the blood, it atones by the soul." That is to say, the blood of every animal sacrifice has been appointed by God as a means of atonement for a human life, because that blood itself is the very life of the animal sacrificed.[2] From this verse, in fact, four truths emerge, viz. first, that animal sacrifices covered souls; second, that this covering was con-

[1] Lev. xvii. 11 (Heb.). The importance of this passage for the comprehension of the nature of *atonement* was recognised by De Wette in his well-known *De Morte Jesu Expiatoria*, 1813, cap. iii. § 6; reprinted in his *Opusculis*, 1830.

[2] The exact significance of this verse has been much disputed: and as it will be necessary to refer to it again and again, it will be well to examine the several interpretations once for all. It is the closing words of the verse which have alone caused difficulty. According to Bähr, Delitzsch, Fairbairn, Keil, Knobel, Kurtz, and Oehler, these closing words should be translated: "For the blood atones *bannephesh,—by, by means of, through,* the soul." A second translation is that of the Septuagint,—*ἀντὶ ψυχῆς*—"the blood atones *for the soul,*"—which has been followed by the Vulgate (*pro animæ piaculo*), the Authorized English Version, Luther's Version, and by Ebrard. Hengstenberg gives another translation, viz. "the blood *atones the soul;*" and Bunsen, Hofmann, and Kliefoth give yet another: "the blood atones *as the soul.*" The whole question is settled by the grammatical construction of *kipper* which obtains elsewhere (see Appendix I.). The construction with the preposition *b'* never signifies what is covered, as Hengstenberg would have it: this is signified either by the simple objective case, or by the preposition *al* or *badh;* nor does it ever signify the thing on behalf of which the covering is made, as in the translation of the Septuagint,—to convey which the construction with *al* or *badh* would also be employed. It never implies, as Hofmann would have it, the character in which blood makes atonement, although this is nearer the mark: the construction with *b'* always signifies either that *by which* the covering is effected, or else *the place where* atonement is made; the latter significance cannot be appropriate in the passage before us.

sequent upon the shedding of blood; third, that the effusion of blood owed its potency to the pouring out of life; and, fourthly, that this acceptance of life was God's will. "Life for life" is thus the motto of blood sacrifice. When blood is shed, atonement is made. Whether atonement was made in any other way is another question, and may be reserved for the present. All we draw attention to now is, that the Jew knew of a surety, by the word of the very law which bade him offer blood, the essential significance of that blood as a means of atonement.

Carrying, then, in the mind these two conceptions of *presentation* and *atonement* which the language of the Law associates with every animal sacrifice, the names and express statements concerning each variety of such sacrifice will enable us to add their distinguishing to their general characteristics.

The *burnt-offering* was at once a sacrifice and an atonement; but it was the element of presentation which was brought by it into especial prominence. The burnt-offering was a whole offering.[1] It is true that, in accordance with the principles of the Mosaic revelation, it had something to do with the covering of the sin of the offerer; still this was a subordinate feature. The burnt-offering atoned that it might be an offering at all. Its existence as a species depended on the fact of its signal expression of the fact of completeness of presentation. Whatever the attribute of presentation in any form conveyed, the burnt-offering conveyed in richest measure. Hence, as has been remarked by many, the burnt-offering was pre-eminently the sacrifice of worship; for presentation being the medium of divine worship, and the burnt-offering being the most vivid form of presentation (which might be offered, too, alone, because of its element of atonement, as no meal-offering or drink-offering could), the burnt-offering was necessarily the sacrifice of worship *par excellence*. From the testimony of the Pentateuch, the name which the Pentateuch invariably employed and its invariable usage, the burnt-offering, whilst embodying both the legally indissociable facts of presentation

[1] See Appendix I.

and atonement, laid stress upon the entirety of presentation and all which that completeness implied. The burnt-offering was the holocaust, the complete, the unreserved animal sacrifice.

The *peace-offering* resembled the burnt-offering in the relative insignificance which it attached to the fact of atonement; it differed in laying stress upon quite another affinity which might exist between God and man. As the burnt-offering provided a means of individual worship, the peace-offering provided a worship that was social. The peace-offerings were, as their name[1] implies, the sacrifices of friendship, and were presented by those who either desired, or lived and rejoiced in, the sense of an established friendship between themselves and their Maker and Preserver. If Abraham could prepare a feast and look on whilst the angels of God partook, the Jew who enjoyed the full privileges of the Law could make a feast and call God Himself to share with him and his family the provided bounty. It is noteworthy that in even these sacrifices of communion there was an associated element of atonement; to parallel what has been said in the preceding paragraph, the peace-offerings atoned that they might be offerings, they were not offerings that they might atone. In fact, just as the burnt-offering concentrated attention upon the act of *union* with God, the peace-offerings emphasized divine *communion;* and whether the offering was brought in gratitude for the divine mercy, or whether it was the spontaneous prompting of a heart yearning for the cementing of divine fellowship, or whether it was a fulfilment of an avowed celebration for the consecration of a household, each of which forms of the sacrifice is expressly mentioned in Leviticus, every peace-offering was a gift to God which, having paid due attention to the necessity of atonement even for the most joyous expression of heart, culminated in a eucharistic feast. It was its festal character which distinguished this class of sacrifices. The peace-offering was, so to speak, the Lord's Supper of the Old Covenant.

In the sin and trespass offerings the student of Jewish

[1] See Appendix I.

antiquities is confronted with a different genus of sacrifices to the two just mentioned; in these it is the fact of atonement itself which is emphasized. These varieties of animal sacrifice were presentations that they might atone.

The *sin-offerings*, as their name implies, were offerings for sin.[1] But it is necessary, in order to appreciate the part they played in the Mosaic economy, to consider for what sins they were commanded to be offered. "Sin-offering" is used in varying senses, and it is well, therefore, to ascertain precisely the characteristics of the species the word includes. The sin-offerings of the Mosaic injunctions may be divided for our purpose into three classes: those which were presented in processes of purification; those which had to do with the expiation of precise sins, whether committed in church or state, by priest or ruler or common Israelite; and those which had to do with the expiation of undefined sins. It is with the singular and general sin-offerings, as they may be called, we are at present concerned,—the purificatory sin-offerings having been already passed under review, when it was seen that they might be defined as offerings *presented in atonement for original sin or its effects*. The essential significance of the singular offerings may be deduced from the laws which regulate them. They could not be presented for any sins, however enormous or wilful, but only in certain well-defined cases, which are divided by the arrangement of the law itself into two distinct categories,—sins of ignorance, and some other analogous sins. To be more explicit, on the one hand the high priest who sinned *through ignorance* in the discharge of any official function, the entire nation when it had broken *through ignorance* any of the divine commands, the ruler who had committed *through ignorance* some dereliction of Mosaic duty, and the ordinary Israelite who had infringed the Levitical injunctions *through ignorance*,—any one, in short, who sinned *through ignorance* against any of the commands of the Lord, had to present a sin-offering; and, on the other hand, sin-offerings were also to be presented in the three following cases, which are sufficiently similar to be classified with the preceding,—viz. when a man had withheld evidence in a criminal cause,

[1] See Appendix I.

when there had been an unintentional defilement with a corpse, and when rash vows had been made only to be broken. These various instances of sin-offering may be subsumed under one definition. For, what is the significance of *bishgagah*,—that is to say, *through ignorance*,—*in error?* Evidently sins committed *bishgagah* included those infringements of the law of which the doer became conscious subsequently to the deed, whether that consciousness arose from a neighbour's expostulation or personal reflection. But the phrase has also a wider meaning: it sometimes refers to sins committed *rashly, unawares, without deliberate intent*, sins resulting, as would be said to-day, from physical or moral weakness; for example, the modern distinction between murder and manslaughter was exactly conveyed by *bishgagah*, —a man who killed another *bishgagah* was one who killed without animosity, without deliberate intent, accidentally.[1] Further, sins committed "through ignorance" or "in error," were legally contrasted with sins committed with a high hand and in haughty rebellion against the Divine Lawgiver; with "sins of presumption," as Magee puts it, "that is, with such as proceeded *not* from human frailty, but from a deliberate and audacious defiance of the divine authority."[2] "The ignorance intended cannot have been of a nature absolute and invincible, but such as the clear promulgation of their law and their strict obligation to study it day and night rendered them accountable for, and which was consequently in a certain degree culpable."[3] The phrase, "through ignorance," is used "of acts against the divine law which have been committed without a consciousness of their illegality, and which have only subsequently been recognised as sins[4]—for example, of sins done unbeknown to the congregation;"[5] but it is also used "of illegal acts which have followed upon weakness or inattention,[6] or have proceeded from some untoward incident,[7] and especially of unintentional sins as

[1] Num. xxxv. 11, 22, 23.
[2] *Discourses upon Atonement*, etc., Diss. xxxvii.
[3] Magee, *ib.*, Diss. xxxvii.
[4] Lev. iv. 13, 22, 27, v. 18, xxii. 14.
[5] Num. xv. 22-26.
[6] Lev. v. 15.
[7] Num. xxxv. 11, 15, 22; Josh. xx. 3, 9.

opposed to sins done violently or deliberately, which were punishable with death,[1] and could not be atoned with sacrifice."[2] These sins "of ignorance" being therefore sins of the flesh (as such sins are frequently termed),—being faults in which the man is overtaken, not in which he is the conscious, foreseeing, and deliberate agent,—it is readily seen that the three specified cases with which the fifth chapter of Leviticus opens are reducible to the same category; for unconscious defilement is manifestly a sin of ignorance in the narrower sense; the idle promises of a boaster are as certainly the extempore effusions of a weak-minded man who does not invariably mean what he says; and, in the case of the withholding of evidence in a criminal cause, this assuredly refers, as the wording of the command signifies, to that repression which arises from misplaced fear or from sympathy with the wrong-doer,[3] instances still of moral or physical weakness. To sum up this discussion, then, it may be said that the essential significance of the *singular* sin-offerings was, that whilst at once gifts and atonements, their especial purpose was to atone for sins of error or ignorance or weakness, whichever word may most suitably be employed for the frequent lapses of depraved human nature. The *general* sin-offerings which were presented on the prominent feast-days on behalf of the whole nation, were not presented in atonement for special sins, but were simply designated sin-offerings without further specification of their purpose. They would therefore appear to be supplementary offerings in atonement for the inevitable sins—for all those unnoted sins which produce the sense of sinfulness—of an inwardly weak, not outwardly rebellious people. At once gifts and atonements, they were pre-eminently atonements for the innumerable and almost unperceived sins of a nation received into divine communion, but still sinning through the frailty of birth and the force of habit. Sharply defined, therefore, the sin-offerings were animal sacrifices offered in atonement for sins of ignorance, which, according to the Mosaic conception, were any sins which did not wilfully contravene the authority of Jehovah.

[1] Num. xv. 27–31. [2] Knobel, *Leviticus*, p. 383. [3] Lev. v. 1 (Heb.).

The *trespass-offerings*, sometimes included even in the Old Testament under the wider name of sacrifices for sin or sin-offerings, were notwithstanding a distinct class.[1] Their *differentia*, it is true, has given rise to considerable discussion; but recent investigations have conclusively shown in what their essential significance consisted. The trespass-offerings were presented in atonement for sins against God or against man which admitted of compensation. If tithes, for example, had been withheld, atonement might be made "before the face of the great Creator and Giver," by repaying the tithes and presenting a trespass-offering. If a fellow-Israelite had been defrauded, atonement might be made by recompensing him with the amount of which he had been defrauded, together with an additional sum by way of indemnity, and the presentation of a trespass-offering. There was in every trespass-offering the idea of retribution. The sin and trespass-offerings were both sacrifices for sin; but in the former the leading idea was that of *atonement*, the expiation of sin by a substituted life; in the latter the leading feature was that of *satisfaction*, the wiping out of sin by the payment of a recompense.[2]

Of the several species of bloodless sacrifices, nothing further needs be said as regards their essential significance, than that they are gifts pure and simple, without any element of atonement, and that they have for their aim to carry this fundamental conception of worship by presentation into all the ramifying relations of life. By the aid of the meat-offerings and drink-offerings and their priestly analogues, the shew-bread and oil and incense, God might be approached by the produce of labour; by the ransoms and first-fruits, He might be approached in recognition of the gifts of child and beast and produce of the earth; even battle might be consecrated by the presentation of spoils. By gifts God could be approached, and the sources of these gifts being various, the divine hallowing might be as various.

Without minutely investigating the essential significance of

[1] See Appendix I.

[2] So substantially Delitzsch, Fairbairn, Hengstenberg, Keil, Küper, Kurtz, Oehler, Riehm, Rinck, Wangemann.

the various holy days of the Jewish calendar, it is sufficient to call to mind that, amongst other uses, these holy days were days for "holy convocation." They were opportunities specially arranged for a more regular and continuous attendance upon the means of grace provided by the Tabernacle and its services. The very chapter which details the various Sabbaths and feast-days, again and again reiterates that these festal days were "holy convocations."[1] If sacrifice might be presented to God every day in the year, the numerous high days from the first month to the last were more especially God-given days for a more detailed and unanimous sacrificial worship. Nor need we seek further for the essential significance of the Mosaic Sabbath and New Moons.

The *Sabbaths* were times of holy convocation, and nothing more. They were pauses authoritatively demanded in the busy life of the world for spiritual as well as physical ends. They stood out amidst the days of the week as the Lord's days; and as peremptorily as the fourth commandment bade, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," did prophets take up the strain and say, "Moreover I, the Lord, gave them My Sabbaths to be a sign between Me and them, that they might know that it is I the Lord that sanctify them."

Of the same general Sabbatic character the *New Moons* partook, and the Sabbatic and Jubilee years. They were times for holy convocation, labour being remitted that religion might be the more engrossing.

The remaining festal times and seasons had an additional characteristic. Besides being holy convocations when there might be public and united adoration of Jehovah, and a general participation in the blessedness which the truths He had graciously revealed were calculated to impart, there was in these other feasts a particular remembrance of some religious crisis in the national history. It was as though each year there was again a remembrance of the principal needs of the religious life, together with a remembrance of the special Divine methods of ministering to those needs. In fact, as the Sabbatic cycle of festivals was fitted to keep alive in the soul the general relations of the Jew to his covenant God,

[1] Lev. xxiii.

so the remaining festivals were individually adapted to fan the flickering flame of some single religious sense only too liable to expire. The several exceptional festivals were ordained to be at once holy convocations, sacred memorials, and blessed seasons, and both history and precept are inadequately estimated if either element is disregarded.

Thus the Passover recalled to mind the "passing over" of the angel bound on his mission of death. As the eye of the angel fell upon the blood sprinkled upon door-posts and lintel, the angel "passed over." Thus, upon every subsequent observance as well as at its first celebration, the thought uppermost in the mind was the divine deliverance from death, and the reception by God of those He had delivered into a new life of fellowship with Himself. The first Passover was the commencement of the special privileges of the chosen nation; every subsequent Passover became a pledge of the continuance of those privileges. The Passover, as it was celebrated from year to year, was a re-enactment, a reiteration, a renewal of that ancient rite which inaugurated the divine adoption of Israel as "a peculiar treasure, a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation," as Jehovah Himself described the liberated Egyptian slaves. Briefly, Passover was a holy convocation, when the first Passover was recapitulated, and the nation again entered upon the amenities of divine forgiveness and adoption. Or, yet more briefly, Passover was the Feast of Justification "made year by year continually."

The *days succeeding the Passover* constituted one long festal season, commencing with the days of Unleavened Bread and ending with *Pentecost*, the Feast of First-fruits. Again there is an addition to the general significance of a festival for a special end. The justified nation has now to submit itself to rules of abstinence and habits of self-sacrifice. A not unsuitable name for this season would be the Feast of Consecration; or, to modify the previous form of speech, the Feast of Weeks, by which name the Old Testament seems sometimes to designate the whole period from Passover to Pentecost, was marked by special days of holy convocation, in which the first joys of national obedience and deliverance

were reiterated, and the people, admitted to the privilege of the divine adoption, testified to its blessedness by willing consecration of self and substance to divine purposes. More briefly, the Feast of Weeks was a Feast of Consecration, "made year by year continually."

A similar line of remark is applicable to the great *Day of Atonement.* The very name recalls the essential significance of the day. It was the day of *atonement.* Throughout the previous year individuals had obtained forgiveness for single sins of omission or light trespass from day to day, and sin-offerings on behalf of the nation had accompanied the principal festivals; but this was a day when high and low, rich and poor, priests and laymen, should receive atonement for their sins. There was not a soul amongst those who were present in the court of the Tabernacle, as the ceremony of the day advanced to its climax, and the high priest donned his ecclesiastical vestments of blue and gold and precious stones, or even amongst those who pondered afar off where the sound of bells and pomegranates was inaudible, who would not know that atonement was being wrought for the holy places, and the priests and all the people of the congregation, "for all their sins."[1] If the Passover effected initiation into the covenant relation, the Day of Atonement achieved forgiveness for those sins of the initiated which would have imperilled that relation. This day of humiliation was by no means a repetition of the Passover, as some have thought. It did not celebrate the entrance of the people upon covenant rights, nor the beneficial remembrance and renewal of that entrance; it was a fast and a penitential season for those who have been already admitted to the divine intimacy. What else, then, could the Day of Atonement signify than the atonement demanded by the sinfulness inseparable even from the reconciled? The Day of Atonement was, as its name and date imply, that holy convocation in which the covenant people were cleansed from the sin contaminating their holiest service,—the Fast of Absolution, "made year by year continually."

Hence follows the meaning of that festival which formed

[1] Lev. xvi. 33, 34.

the climax of the festive seasons of the year, the Feast of Tabernacles. Naturally enough, it was jubilant and exultant; dances and singing and mirth were its just accompaniments. For a time, at least, there was a joyous sojourn in the courts of the Lord's house, and a kind of Paradise Regained, where redeemed man might hear the voice of God amidst the leaves of the trees in which the swallow had built her nest. The season represented the joy of the elect who dwell in Jehovah's temple, with glee and without fear. The Feast of Tabernacles was, so to speak, the Feast of the Joy of the Reconciled.[1]

Before plunging, therefore, into the mazes of Levitical symbolism or the mists of Mosaic typology, it has become abundantly evident, from an examination which has not extended further than the Hebrew Onomasticon and the express words of the Pentateuch, and which has not, therefore, touched upon the debateable regions of possible inference or probable suggestion, that there was much in the Mosaic injunctions of the utmost value to the deepest religious wants of the Jew. For the times then present as well as for subsequent ages, spiritual guidance and satisfaction of a very high kind were afforded by this worship of various sacrifice. Indeed, we have been enabled to see that any Jew who thought upon the language he habitually employed, or listened with any attention to the words of the Law which it was the duty of the Levites to recite, would have had a sufficiency of material for faith, and that without any special theological training "the wayfaring man, though a fool, could not err therein." In that sacrificial constitution, upon which his eye could look every day, were portrayed for any man who believed in God, and in the possibility of His revealing Himself, all the essentials of true religion. As the Jew regarded the sacred structure of the Tabernacle, the eye whispered to the soul that God Most High dwelt in the midst of His nation, and might be approached in worship. As his attention was engrossed by the gorgeous vestments and busy ministrations of priests and Levites, he

[1] Compare the author's essay on "The Levitical Sacrifices Literally Considered" in the *Pulpit Commentary*, "Leviticus," pp. xix–xxi.

would recognise a divinely appointed organization, by whose mediation and intercession divine worship might be beneficially and innocuously conducted. In the performance of the rites of purification, the truth was palpable, that hereditary taints and personal faults which might intelligibly hinder approach to God, however disqualifying in their nature, might be neutralized. At the same time, the divinely arranged series of animal and bloodless gifts would deliver the messages with which they were divinely laden, the welcome and inspiriting messages of the forgiveness of sins and a possibility of uninterrupted, or only momentarily interrupted, fellowship with God. In the sin-offering he would recognise the divinely arranged instrument for obtaining forgiveness for sins of weakness and ignorance; in the trespass-offering, a fitting retribution for frauds against God or man: the burnt-offering would be an aid to consecration, the peace-offering a channel of communion. The yearly round of sacred days and festivals was also fitted, he could see, to convey a series of religious truths of high importance. In short, the Mosaic injunctions, if their essential significance alone be regarded, brought into satisfactory prominence the consolatory and instructive truths of the divine nearness and approachableness, of human sin in its stupendous effects upon the physical nature and the conscience, together with the possibility of atonement, forgiveness, and restoration to the divine favour. The Jew who could devoutly say, "I believe in Jehovah, Maker of heaven and earth," could add to his creed the further articles, "I believe in the shechinah, the Tabernacle and priesthood, the communion of saints, and the forgiveness of sins;" — no inconsiderable spiritual equipment! Doubtless this religion was ideal, but so is all religion of high value.

CHAPTER III.

THE SYMBOLIC SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MOSAIC INJUNCTIONS.

"How natural in all decisive circumstances is symbolic representation to all kinds of men! . . . An Almack's masquerade is not nothing. . . . But what, on the other hand, must not sincere earnest have been! . . . A whole nation gathered in the name of the Highest, under the eye of the Highest; imagination herself flagging under the reality; and all noblest ceremony as yet not grown ceremonial, but solemn, significant to the outmost fringe!"—CARLYLE, *French Revolution*, Vol. II. Book I. chap. ix.

BY means of what has been termed their essential significance, many of the Mosaic injunctions receive an adequate explanation. For it follows that if the presence of God was to be taught in the wilderness by a visible dwelling-place, there must have been a tent of some form, with its arrangements for speedy removal and expeditious erection—its coverings, its cords, its sockets, its pillars; and if the revelation of the divine presence was to be accommodated to different grades of worshippers, that the tent must also have been divided by some such threefold disposition as into Court, and Holy Place, and Holiest. Or if the several altars were to be the special meeting-places between Jehovah and an adoring people, those altars must have been adapted, according to precedent or convenience, to the presentation of their appropriate sacrifices; the incense must have had its table, and the burnt-offerings their hearth. So, if there was to be a selected class of ministrants, whose whole time and attention were to be concentrated upon the task of divine service, suitable provision must have been made for their support, and fitting dwellings have been assigned for their abode. And so also, if atonement was to be made by the blood of domestic animals, those animals must have been slain; and if presentations were to be made of their flesh, their

carcases must have been flayed. Indeed, a moment's thought will convince that very many details of the Levitical ritual were the immediate consequents upon the several features of the essential significance of the Mosaic revelation. In the essential significance, therefore, of the Mosaic injunctions,—that is to say, in the doctrinal principles which the Law provided for its own interpretation,—a considerable advance has been made towards the comprehension of the commands imparted during the years of wandering.

But in the course of the preceding chapter, the reader must have been struck by the singularity of the method by which these doctrinal principles were conveyed. Religious truths are represented under sensuous forms: "ideas are clothed, as it were, with a bodily substance, and those things which are comprehended by the intellect alone are brought before the eyes in a kind of sensible delineation."[1] In this complicated legal system, divine worship is allegorical without being capricious, and sacramental without becoming idolatrous. The supersensuous is taught by the senses, spirit is informed by flesh. If the Jew is to learn the divine accessibility, a visible sanctuary where the Omnipresent condescends to limit His attributes is placed before the eyes; if he is bidden bethink himself of the holiness of the elect priesthood, white vestments become aids to thought; if he is urged to approach the Lord God Merciful and Gracious in humble confession of sins or heartfelt gratitude, sin-offerings and burnt-offerings are placed in his hands. This sacrificial system was, in fact, minutely symbolical,—symbolical of things to come, and symbolical of things then present. It will be convenient, however, to restrict the word *symbol* to that which is a *sensuous representation of a truth or fact already revealed*, and to employ the word *type* for *a sensuous representation of a truth or fact yet to be revealed*. By the study of the symbolism of the Mosaic injunctions in this narrower sense, another great step will have been taken in the elaboration of the Mosaic doctrine of Sacrifice.

The one canon for the accurate and precise study of the symbolical significance of the Mosaic injunctions in this narrower sense is—that the spheres of the symbolical and

[1] Faber, *Horæ Mosaicæ*, The Bampton Lectures for 1801, vol. ii. p. 234.

essential significance are co-extensive. The Mosaic injunctions are largely symbolical, inasmuch as they largely embody the doctrinal principles which have been already classified as their essential significance. This is but saying that the limits of the interpretation of the Levitical symbolism are the limits of the announcements of the Levitical revelation. It is as untrue to say that the law does not provide an authoritative verbal interpretation of the symbolism of its numerous prescriptions,[1] as to say that symbolical significance must be gained rather from inference than express statement.[2] The results of the preceding chapter are a key to the long-sealed chambers. Of course it must not be disguised that there are difficulties in the use of the key. A symbol is not a doctrine exactly definable in so many words, but a visible sign, a sensuous representation, the value of which lies in its suggestive power. "Its realm is darkness and twilight; it is like a half-closed bud, which contains within its cup the extremest beauty undeveloped."[3] Further, the suggestive power of the symbol is conditioned by the mental and spiritual power of the onlooker. Every man must have understood something of the essential significance of the various Levitical commands; but, within the circle of ideas thus sharply delineated, the amount of religious instruction and consolation derived would vary with the spiritual receptivity and the mental culture of the worshipper. What different men saw in the Tabernacle and its services, would be as dissimiliar in intensity and breadth as what men of the same culture and unlike capacity see to-day in a landscape or starry night; and, side by side with some commonplace, unimaginative man, to whom a primrose was simply a yellow primrose, and who found in the Tabernacle an unmeaning and needless pageant, a David might be upon his knees, his heart and imagination full to overflowing, and the prayer audibly issuing from his lips: "Open Thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of Thy law." It was to those who, like Joshua, meditated day and night upon it, that the

[1] Compare Davison, *On Prophecy*, pp. 139–150; *Primitive Sacrifice*, p. 89.

[2] Compare Litton, *Mosaic Dispensation*, pp. 85, 86.

[3] Creuzer, *Symbolik und Mythologie der alten Völker*, vol. iv. p. 641.

Law yielded its ritual as well as doctrinal treasures; and it was neither in the power nor in the inclination of every one to so meditate. Besides, the difficulties arising, whether from the suggestive character of symbolism or from the receptive nature of the onlooker, are enhanced for the modern student of the Old Testament worship. For him to ascertain the symbolical bearings of the sacrificial worship of the Pentateuch, *may* be a task for which he is unfitted by a personal deficiency of the requisite poetical and spiritual faculty, but for which he *must* be partially incapacitated by the fact that the Tabernacle and its services exist only in the historical imagination. To resuscitate the ancient symbolism is to resuscitate first the ancient rites and then their symbolism. What once spoke to the eye as a living faith, can only address itself now to the representative faculty as a dead faith laboriously restored. To recall the suggestiveness of the spiritual life of the Exodus, is like firing the imagination with oriental skies one has never seen. Nevertheless, to the task we must bend ourselves, and our labours will not be fruitless if but an inkling of the eloquence of the Sinaitic faith seizes upon the mind. It is not an entirely unknown language we are to study; these hieroglyphics of the past will yield their secret to him who knows the alphabet of their essential significance.

But a further preliminary question calls for solution, "Where is symbolism to be expected?" If it be granted that the spheres of the symbolic and essential significance are co-extensive, is every detail of the Mosaic injunctions symbolic? and if not, how is the non-symbolic to be eliminated? Various principles have been propounded to detect where symbolism is latent and where not. One writer, whose now classic work upon this subject has effected a revolution in the study of the Old Testament ceremonial, contents himself with the vague rule, that in every symbol that which constitutes it a symbol must be accurately distinguished from that which is merely subordinate and accessory;[1] but this is the very difficulty, to decide what is subordinate and what accessory. Another writer regards those features of the Mosaic ceremonial as unimportant and adventitious which were presented in other

[1] Bähr, *Symbolik*, Deutungs-regeln VI. vol. i. pp. 50, 51; ed. 2, p. 93.

forms in Solomon's Temple.[1] Thus, in his esteem such details were manifestly non-symbolical, as the acacia framework which was afterwards superseded by cedar, and the laver which became so greatly altered in form in the molten sea; but this principle, however valuable in itself, is far from adequate, and labours, besides, under the disadvantage of deferring certainty as to the extent of symbolism till the date of the erection of the Temple. Some, in the difficulty of the question, have denied altogether any symbolical significance in one sentence to exemplify such a sense in the next.[2] And others, yet again, have fallen back upon a critical sense trained in Old Testament studies as the only possible umpire.[3] The true solution of the question is a corollary to what we have previously laid down as the canon of symbolism — the co-extension of the essential and symbolic senses; that corollary being—*wherever any ritual injunction is not necessitated by some feature of the essential significance, there look for symbolism.* Illustrations of this principle may be found in any of the classes of the Mosaic injunctions. The Tabernacle, for example, is declared to be the only legal place of meeting between Jehovah and His people: now, if there was to be a visible sanctuary at all under the conditions of the wilderness life, that sanctuary must be a portable tent; for the significance, therefore, of a covering of skins, or of an elaborate apparatus of cords and bars and sockets and tenons and rods, all necessary consequences of the prime idea, it is unnecessary to look further. But the sacred tent was constructed of other materials than those commonly employed; its ground-plan was different, and its elevation was novel: in all such aberrations symbolism may be expected. Again, a priesthood was specially constituted for divine service. In the facts that such an elected class must have food to eat, and houses to dwell in, and clothes to wear, it is foolish to look for symbolism; but if a peculiar food, special cities, excep-

[1] Hengstenberg, *Authentie des Pentateuch*, vol. ii. p. 631.

[2] *E.g.* Fairbairn, *Typology*, vol. ii. pp. 238–241.

[3] *E.g.* Kalisch, *Leviticus*, A. ix.: "Though, therefore, some of the ceremonies have a spiritual meaning, others cannot, without unprofitable playfulness, be interpreted symbolically: a correct appreciation of the nature of the Law will aid the judgment in fixing the distinction."

tional vestments are commanded, in such commands symbolism may be expected. Or, turning to the sacrifices themselves, it is not in the fact of gifts being presented that any symbolical element is to be presumed, but in the nature of the gift itself; it is not in the fact of presentation that we suspect symbolism, but in the ritual in which that presentation is arrayed. In fine, as in nature design is looked for not in the sequence of cause and effect, but in collocations of causes and coincidences of effects, so in the Mosaic injunctions symbolism—that is to say, a designed correspondence of matter and thought—may be expected not in details necessary to the very existence of the Mosaic revelations, but in unexpected collocations and coincidences super-essential.

Again, as in the two preceding chapters, the caution is necessary to proceed step by step, advancing from the simpler elements of the ritual to the more complex. Instead, for example, of endeavouring to enunciate the symbolical references of so intricate a ceremony as the ritual of the Day of Atonement, or even of the daily service, with all its diversified detail of popular presentation and priestly procedure, it will greatly conduce to the ease and success of our investigation if the method previously adopted be still adhered to, and we develope, in the first place, the symbolic significance of the special place of sacrifice, then of the sacrificial ministrants, next of the purifications and sacrifices, afterwards of the legal enactments of the entire calendar.

The thoughts which filled the mind of the intelligent Israelite as he regarded the *sacred tent of Jehovah*, have been deduced in the preceding chapter. The Tabernacle was to the Jew, unless he discredited what he believed to be the voice of Jehovah Himself, the one place where Jehovah condescended to meet with His people; and it consisted of various parts, because of the conditions under which that meeting took place. These two articles of the Jewish creed were taught to the intellect by the express revelation of God Himself; they were conveyed to the eye by metallic lustre, gorgeous colouring, imposing and awful adjuncts. Symbolic details relieved by their brilliant setting the jewels of the Sinaitic faith. Apply-

ing the test just enunciated to the various injunctions of the Tabernacle, symbolical elements may be supposed to lie in the materials of which it was constructed, the plan on which it was built, and its several articles of furniture.

The materials of which the Tabernacle was commanded to be made were, as has been already seen, the wood of the *acacia vera*,—gold, silver, and brass,—three coverings of skins, and one of parti-coloured tapestry. Of these the three coverings of skins are the common coverings of Eastern tents, and manifestly have their purpose in protection: they therefore call for no further notice; it is in the extraordinary the symbolical resides. The other materials are exquisitely adapted for symbolical representation. The acacia is the *lignum imputrabile* of the Orientals, incorruptibility itself, the facile defier of putrefaction.[1] Gold, from its proud pre-eminence amongst even the noble metals, must ever be the emblem of all that is glorious and beautiful, the fitting ornament of kingly palaces, the appropriate adornment of a divine residence. Brass retains something of the suggestiveness of gold, although the lesser brilliancy of its colour and the lesser brightness of its gleam speak of a gold that is dulled.[2] Silver will always be eloquent of purity.[3] And when we come to the richly woven tapestry hangings fit for a palace, did not their white speak of holiness,[4] its blue of the vault of heaven, the footstool of the Almighty,[5] their purple of regal splendour,[6] and their scarlet of a full and free and joyous life,[7] such as is the attribute of God? were not their cherubim a secure body-guard?

The symbolism of the ground-plan lay in the position the sacred structure invariably occupied relatively to the camp. On the pitching of tents the Tabernacle was ever the centre of the entire assembly; and whilst the priests and Levites

[1] The Septuagint renders *shittim* by ἀσηπτόν, the *unrotting* tree κατ' ἐξοχήν (*e.g.* Ex. xxvi. 32, 37, xx., xvi. 34). It is noteworthy that the cedar which was subsequently employed in the construction of the Temple is often designated ἀσηπτόν (see Theodoret on Ezra xvii. 22).

[2] Compare Isa. lx. 17.

[3] Compare Isa. i. 22.

[4] Lev. xvi. 4; comp. Isa. lxi. 10.

[5] Ex. xxiv. 10.

[6] Compare Esther viii. 15; Sol. Song iii. 10; Dan. v. 7, 16, 29; 1 Macc. x. 20, 22, 64, xiv. 43; 2 Macc. iv. 38.

[7] Compare 2 Sam. v. 24; Sol. Song iv. 3; Lam. iv. 5.

formed an immediate cordon round it, the tents of the entire assembly surrounded them—Judah, Issachar, and Zebulon to the north; Ephraim, Benjamin, and Manasseh to the south; Dan, Asher, and Naphtali to the east; and Reuben, Simeon, and Gad to the west. The encampment, indeed, presented the appearance of a gigantic wheel,—the Tabernacle and tents of the priests forming its box, so to speak, and the lines between the several tribal encampments the twelve spokes. Thus, to every tribe the Tabernacle was equally visible; in other words, Jehovah was no respecter of persons, and He visibly dwelt without partiality in the midst of the whole nation.

There was a beautiful and expressive symbolism also in the furniture of the Holy Places,—the points calling for express notice being the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, and the general form of the altar in the Holiest. Many conjectures have been made as to the purpose of the four altar horns, some supposing them to have been intended to tie the sacrificial victims to when refractory, others seeing in them handles for those who sought sanctuary, others aids for transport, others trophies of the bodies consumed upon the altar, and others emblems of power or empire, dignity or excellence.[1] The purpose to which the horns were always put, as is significantly enough seen in the ritual of the sin-offerings, suggests another meaning. The horns would appear to have been regarded as the quintessence of the altar. If the altar was earth or rock "raised" a little, as the etymology of the word implies, the horns were the altar itself "raised." If to sprinkle blood upon the altar was to present it before God, to sprinkle blood upon the horns was to bring it pre-eminently into the divine presence. The horns peculiarly presented the essential significance of the altar in symbolical form. As to the symbolism of the ark and the mercy-seat, it was exquisitely adapted to its end. The ark was but an ornamental box to contain the tables of the law, the mercy-seat a gold plate with overshadowing golden cherubim; but what a fund of mysterious allusion there was in this artistic combination! In the Holy of Holies the Almighty had, so to speak, His

[1] See Spencer, *De Legibus Hebræis*, Book III. Dissert. i. §§ 2 and 3.

audience-chamber, and this plate of gold was His throne; over it hovered the shechinah, the visible symbol of the divine presence in the times of its revelation; the wings of cherubim, the divine executive of ministry, sheltered it; when blood was sprinkled before it, it was sprinkled, as it were, before the very eyes of God; that throne, too, was established in righteousness: for the decalogue was its foundation, and the observance of those ten commands the condition of its occupation.

Singularly harmonious, therefore, with the idea of the Tabernacle as a place where the great God condescended for a time to dwell was its body-guard of cherubim, its lustre of brass and silver and gold, and its brilliant colouring. Where Jehovah was, glory must be; and it was fitting that His blessed attributes should be symbolized to rude and callous natures by all the pomp and splendour which surround a throne. If the Jew was conscious that beneath that rugged tent-cloth Deity had humbled Himself to reside, the fittings and ornamentation all enhanced the idea, and he saw a dwelling-place eloquent of His exalted rank, His spotless purity, His rich and flowing life. The position of the sanctuary would tell its tale of equality of national privileges; and when the Jew regarded the limitations under which God had promised to reveal Himself, he would also recognise that the entire plan, construction, and appurtenances of the Tabernacle were so arranged as to symbolize those limitations. The glow of gold and the gleam of colour would tell that every square inch of the sacred enclosure was consecrated ground; but the several divisions of the sacred area would suggest, by the variety of detail employed, as well as by the appropriate utensils, the grades of access appointed by Jehovah. In the Court the Jew could approach Jehovah not directly, but in the person of His appointed representatives; the Court was thus the meeting-place of least honour; appropriately enough, therefore, in its construction white linen and valuable metals are employed, but at the same time the curtains are simply white, and the metals are the least valuable, namely, brass and copper and silver. Then at the altar of burnt-offering, where the significance of the Court had its highest expression, the sentiment made

itself felt, that, notwithstanding that this was a spot somewhat nearer to God, and struggling apparently in the horns, like the spire of some Gothic church, to surmount the lower structure; yet, after all, this altar was but a convenient apparatus of wood and copper for raising mother earth or native rock a little above the ordinary terrene level. In the Holy Place the priests could serve and worship—not directly, it must again be said, but by participation in the adoration of their chief, and by their approach to the anteroom, so to speak, of the divine audience-chamber: the Holy Place was thus a spot of higher, yet not the highest honour; and again, appropriately enough, its pure white was threaded with brilliant colouring, and its metallic fittings were of gold: the altar of incense, which was not far off from the glory within the veil, was also appropriately made of gold artistically wrought. But it was within the Holiest, where once a year the high priest came, after solemn preparation, and gazed unhindered upon the cloud which enshrined the burning revelation of Deity, that symbolism reached its most perfect expression: there reigned grandeur and gloom; the whole was of perfect cubical form; cherubs worked in bright colours stood out from the white tapestry; every hook was of gold; and, as on a throne of burning gold, which was also the high altar, the symbol of the divine presence rested beneath the wings of symbolic angels. Assuredly that priest who could approach the mercy-seat, even by aid of the blood of atonement, without fear and trembling, must have been either superhuman, or utterly devoid of imagination and the sense of the sublime.

Again, the essential significance of the *priesthood* lay, as has been seen, not in the native holiness or super-eminent fitness of its members for their exalted position, but in four attributes,—its divine election, its attributed holiness, its nearer access, and its official service. These characteristics were also represented sensuously; the eye was enlisted on behalf of the spirit in those privileges, prerequisites, habits, consecration, duties, and vestments which have been previously detailed at sufficient length. In fact, a most minute and varied symbolism had been invented by which to convey to

the dullest mind the high regard in which the entire order of the priesthood was divinely held, and by which to impress upon the coarsest nature within the hierarchy itself the purity of character and act divinely demanded of the priest. Should one learn the holiness of the appointed ministrants? Their characteristic of holiness was sensuously represented by their faultless physical constitution, their mature age, and their stern and secluded habit of life. Having been appointed to divine service, they were to know no distracting cares in the tillage of land or bodily labour: "I am thy part and thine inheritance among the children of Israel, saith the Lord." What could speak more plainly of the solemnity of their approach to God than their serving barefoot? Then their official attire uttered its message with more potency than words: the pure white and the cleanly linen—"the robe of righteousness," as it is called in the Psalms—spoke of outward holiness; and the coloured girdle, with its inseparable associations with the rite of dedication, was immediately recognisable as connected with the Holy Place. In the ceremonial of consecration the whole of the attributes were symbolically displayed: the exclusion of those who had physical defects was a subtle form of divine election; as the process of purification proceeded at the laver, when the novice was clad in his official robes, when the sacred oil of anointing was poured upon the head, there spoke as articulately as acts could speak the cleansing and setting apart for divine service; and when the newly-installed priest offered his triple sacrifice, the sin-offering was a sign of the forgiveness of his sins, the burnt-offering was a sign of the entireness of his consecration, and the peace-offering emblematized his oneness with the Master whom he served. Whatever feature of the priesthood be regarded, it will be seen that the symbolic significance deepens the impression of the essential significance.

Exactly the same attributes were visible in the high priest in an intensified form; and in an intensified form his privileges, his rules of conduct, the extended rites of his consecration, and his official vestments are symbolic. His was a stricter cleanliness, his was a more solemn consecration, his was a more elaborate investiture. If the ordinary priest wore

four official garments, he wore twice as many, as priest *κατ' ἐξοχήν*. "Holiness to the Lord" was conspicuous upon his mitre. His divine call was consequent upon his birth. His dedication to the Lord was apparent in every official act. His privilege of divine access, ordinarily seen in his daily ministrations at the altar of incense, was most plainly witnessed in the solemn ritual of the Day of Atonement. And what could more conclusively bespeak his exceptional mediation than his daily passage (to say nothing of his yearly passage into the Holiest), with the breastplate and its twelve representative stones glittering in the light, within the curtain of the Holy Place?

So also the whole of the ceremonial of *purification* was profoundly symbolic, stamping deeply upon the mind the essential significance of these cleansing rites. We shall pass these rites over hastily, as the vast provinces of the symbolism of the Tabernacle and priesthood have been hastily travelled over, in order that we may come the more speedily to the symbolism of the sacrifices proper; but the exigencies of our plan demand some glimpses. How beautifully, for example, is the act of cleansing symbolized by washing with water! How pointedly are the contaminating effects of original sin presented to the eye by the multitudinous occasions which demand purification! To show, however, the power of symbolism to convey religious truth, we select the rites for the purification of the leper as an astonishing instance.

The leper, by reason of his disease, had to submit to a double estrangement,—in the first place, from the covenant nation; and in the second, from the national sanctuary. The rites of his purification had reference to this double ban, and consisted of two separate services. The earlier ceremony had to do with the restoration of the convalescent leper to the theocratic privileges from which he had been excluded by his disease. After he had been pronounced sound and well by a priest who had examined him without the camp, two birds, together with a little cedar wood, a shred of scarlet cloth, or a thread of scarlet wool, and a little hyssop were brought, and the rite commenced. One of the birds was killed in such a way that its blood mingled with some fresh spring water con-

tained in an earthen vessel. The live bird, the cedar, scarlet, and hyssop were then dipped into the reddened water, the healed leper was sprinkled seven times with the purifying mixture, and the bird was let loose,—an exquisitely symbolic act of reinstatement, the full purport of which, in its deep typical significance, was not within the reach of the Jew. Still the Jew could see that the death of one bird was the cleansing of the other, the blood of the one the instrument of a restored life to its fellow. It was apparent enough that the bird let loose into the open country was a symbol to the leper of himself; and as he considered the method by which release was obtained from the social ban under which he laboured, what food was there for thought as well as thankfulness! It was he who was first cleansed by water and blood, and it was he who subsequently rose as from death into a free and unfettered life—a life, too, the significance of which was intensified by those symbolic accompaniments, the incorruptible cedar, the detergent hyssop, and the fresh full life of which the scarlet spoke. The second ceremony, by which the leper was reinstated in his religious privileges, was equally expressive. On the seventh day the entire body was shaved and bathed, and the clothes washed—a reiterated purification by way of preliminary to the coming rites. The eighth day brought a sacrificial expiation. The leper and his offerings having been solemnly presented before God at the altar of burnt-offering, the atoning and sanctifying rites commenced. First a lamb and oil were waved before the Lord, and the lamb was offered for a trespass-offering—that is to say, for a restitution to Almighty God for the sins of omission throughout the long course of enforced banishment from the divine presence. The slaughter of this lamb was followed by a most singular ceremony; some of the blood was smeared by the officiating priest upon the tip of the leper's right ear, the tip of his right thumb, and the great toe of his right foot, and then upon the same spots oil was smeared; it was the atonement of ear, foot, and hand, and their consecration thenceforth to the service of Jehovah. The remainder of the oil was then poured upon the head of the worshipper, and the whole man consecrated to the Lord. A sin-offering followed in atonement for sins of com-

mission, this sin-offering presenting yet more forcibly the fact of the divine forgiveness. Afterwards came a burnt-offering and a meat-offering, thus closing the ceremony with a beautifully symbolic expression of the fact of restoration to the privileges of divine worship.

Then how eloquent and suggestive was the entire ritual of *sacrifice!*

What could more forcibly delineate the desire to approach the Deity in the way He had Himself ordained, than to bring the appropriate victim to the altar of burnt-offering, and there present it before the Lord? To select the victim from its fellows, to lead it by a halter across the sacred threshold of the Court, to enter the sacred precincts of the place where the Lord God, Who had made bare His arm in Egypt to destroy, now made bare His arm in the Tabernacle to save, to present the he-goat or the lamb to His chosen servants the priests,—what was all this but most expressively to objectify the desire to come near to God? To present an animal at the altar of burnt-offering, was to approach symbolically the Most High in sacrifice.

And how emphatic was the rite of the imposition of the hand! When the animal had been presented, "the offerer forcibly laid his hand upon its head—his hand, not his slave's; his hand, not his substitute's, nor his wife's, but his own hand;" [1] and the act was peculiarly expressive. As the children of Israel laid their hands upon the Levites to dedicate them to that service of the Lord which was the duty of the whole nation, "to offer the Levites for an offering before the Lord;" [2] as the involuntary hearer of blasphemy, polluted by the unintentional overhearing, laid his hand upon the blasphemer to relieve himself from his accidental participation in the crime by devoting the criminal himself to bear the lawful doom; [3] as Moses laid his hand upon Joshua to dedicate him to the high office of leader in his place,[4] so the offerer of

[1] "Imponit quisque manum suam, non manum servi; manum suam, non manum vicarii sui; manum suam, non manum uxoris suæ."—Outram, *De Sacrificiis*, chap. i.

[2] Num. viii. 10, 11. [3] Lev. xxiv. 14. [4] Num. xxvii. 18.

every animal sacrifice laid his hand upon the creature's head, to dedicate it to the purpose for which it was brought. The imposition of the hand was a visible devotion of the victim to the purposes of animal sacrifice.[1]

In the aspersion of blood upon the altar, the bringing of the atoning soul of the victim into the divine presence is symbolized, as will be at once understood from the classic passage which has been already quoted: "For the soul of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to atone for your souls: for it is the blood that atones by the

[1] Upon the right understanding of this act the interpretation of Mosaic sacrifice largely turns; or perhaps it may be more rightly said, the interpretation of this act is a crucial test of the validity of any theory of Old Testament sacrifice. Two classes of expositions have been, for the most part, advocated. On the one hand, it has been alleged that the imposition of the hand was simply expressive of the transference to the victim of that special intention in which the offering was brought: that intention being sometimes the recognition of sin, but sometimes of gratitude or rejoicing. This is the opinion of Delitzsch, *Commentar zum Hebräerbrief* (translated in *Foreign Theological Library*, vol. ii. p. 452); Ewald, *Alterthümer*, p. 58; Hengstenberg, *Die Opfer*, p. 15 (*Ecclesiastes*, p. 378); Keil, *Archäologie*, vol. i. p. 206 (Eng. Trans. vol. i. p. 267); Neumann, *Die Opfer des A. B.*, p. 343; Oehler, Herzog, vol. x. p. 627, and *Theologie des Alt. Test.* (translated in *Foreign Theological Library*), § 126; Ritschl, *Die christliche Lehre*, vol. ii. p. 191; Sykes, *Essay on Sacrifice*, p. 25, etc.; Tholuck, *Das Alt. Test. in N. T.*, § 3, 6th ed. p. 92: it is a phase of the same opinion which Kalisch advocates, when he says that the act in question indicated "the personal and intimate relation between the worshipper and the victim" (*Leviticus*, A. x. 4). On the other hand, it has been maintained that this act of the ritual signified at every time and in every place a transference of sinfulness: so Ebrard, *Die Lehre v. d. stellvertretenden Genugthuung*, p. 48; Fairbairn, *Typology* (T. & T. Clark), vol. ii. p. 312; Kliefoth, *Liturgische Abhandlungen*, vol. iv. p. 51; Küper, *Das Priesterthum*, p. 115; Hävernick, *Vorlesungen über d. Theologie des Alt. Test.*, p. 190; Magee, *Discourses upon Sacrifice and Atonement*, Dissert. xxxii.; Stöckl, *Das Opfer*, p. 246; Thomson, *Atoning Work of Christ*, p. 68; and commonly amongst Jewish Rabbis (see Ugolino, *Thesaurus*, vol. ii. p. 860, etc.). This second view is unscriptural and contradictory. To speak of the imposition of the hand as symbolical of the transference of sin, is to open wide the door to frequent contradictions; if the victim, for example, carry the sins of the offerer, how can that sacrifice be termed, as it so often is, "holy," "most holy"? how can its blood be sprinkled upon the altar, the dwelling-place of God? The principal argument relied on to prove that imposition was symbolical of the transfer of guilt is that, on the Day of Atonement, the high priest laid his hand upon the head of the goat which was not slaughtered, thus placing upon it the sins of the people (see Lev. xvi. 21). But the cases are not analogous. It is forgotten that before "this undoubted act of transference of guilt," the hand of the priest *had been already laid* upon the head of the slaughtered goat. If that first act of imposition—which alone paralleled the common sacrificial rite—

soul;"[1] in other words, sacrificial blood atones, and atones inasmuch as it symbolizes the soul or life of the sacrificial victim.[2] Blood is life *in compendio*,[3] and so atones, "It was a fundamental axiom: 'The life of the flesh is in the blood;' or, 'The blood is the soul:' soul and blood were correlative notions; hence dying was expressed by 'pouring out the soul;' to 'shed blood' meant 'to destroy life;' the blood and the soul of the murdered were said alike to cry to heaven for vengeance; 'pure blood' became synonymous with 'a pure soul;' and even the combination, 'the soul of pure blood,' was formed to denote a guiltless person."[4] In the priestly sprinkling, therefore, of the blood in any recognised way upon the altar, we have the chosen mediators approaching Jehovah and presenting before God the means of atonement He had Himself ordained. In the altar of burnt-offering—and the same is true *mutatis mutandis* of the other altars—we have the place where Jehovah condescended to meet His people in sacrifice; in the priest, the ministrant especially selected for divine approach; in the blood of the animal slaughtered, the appointed means of atonement; and thus, in the sprinkling of the blood by the priest upon the altar, the due presenting to God of an atoning life.

There are still two acts of the general sacrificial procedure remaining; for, from our previous analysis, it will have been seen that the whole procedure common to the various sacrifices

signified the transference of the guilt of the people, how came it that those sins still remained upon the people, and could be placed a second time upon the head of the second goat? Nor is the other view—that which sees in the act of imposition not the transference of guilt, but the transference of the predominant feeling of the worshipper—any more scriptural; for this there is even less plausible evidence than for the view just discussed. So, too, Kurtz is no nearer the mark when he maintains the imposition of hands to symbolize the transference of the punishment due to the offerer's sins, instead of the transference of his sins. See *Alttest. Opfercultus*, §§ 36-42, p. 72 (English Translation, pp. 82-101). The imposition of the hand symbolized—as Hofmann, *Der Schriftbeweis*, vol. ii. p. 246; Knobel, *Leviticus*, p. 354; and Schultz, *Alttest. Theologie*, 1st ed. vol. i. p. 248, have said—a dedication of the victim to the double purpose of atonement and sacrifice. Erroneous views upon this point are the infallible consequences of erroneous views upon Mosaic symbolism generally. See Part. III. chap. iv.

[1] Lev. xvii. 11.

[2] See note 2, p. 100.

[3] Kahnis, *Die Lutherische Dogmatik*, etc., vol. i. p. 272.

[4] Kalisch, *Leviticus*, Essay A. § ix. 7.

might be summarized as follows. On any motive inciting thereto, the offerer, whether priest or layman, having selected the victim in obedience to the legal prescriptions, brought it to the altar, laid his hand forcibly upon its head, and slaughtered it, with the assistance of the Levites apparently; there the duties of the layman ended. A priest then collected the blood of the animal in a basin, and applied it to the altar wholly or partially, sometimes in one way and sometimes in another, according to the nature of the sacrifice (in certain cases the blood was also applied to the altar of incense or the mercy-seat); afterwards he flayed, dismembered, cleansed, and burnt the carcase wholly or partially, in most cases retaining the skin as his perquisite. The burnt-offerings alone were holocausts; in the peace-offerings, the remainder, after the separation of certain portions which fell to the officiating priest, constituted a sacrificial feast for the offerer and his family; in the sin-offering or trespass-offering the remainder was either burnt without the camp, or, as in other cases, eaten by the priests in the holy places; with the burnt-offerings and peace-offerings meat and drink offerings were united, but with the offerings for sin and trespass never. From this summary of the ritual, it will be seen that there were certain general features common to every animal sacrifice; these general features were the selection of the animal, the presentation, the imposition of the hand, mactation, the reception of the blood, the manipulation with the blood, flaying, cleansing, dismembering, the combustion, the feasting: of which the selection, the mactation, the reception of the blood, the flaying, cleansing, and dismembering are as manifestly necessitated by the essential significance of animal sacrifice as the remaining processes are symbolic.

The act of combustion upon the altar-hearth, whether partial or complete, was also exquisitely representative of the idea of sacrifice. Atonement, the peculiar aim of animal sacrifice, having been made by the blood, the gift of the flesh, the further purpose of animal sacrifice, was to be made, and it was made before the very eyes of the worshipper. As the divided portions of the carcase were arranged in the heaven-born fire,[1]—

[1] Lev. ix. 24, compare vi. 13.

for the sacred fire upon the altar had first issued forth from the divine presence at the ceremony of the consecration of the Tabernacle, and, like the flame of the candlestick, had never been permitted to go out,—it was seen to burn, to become refined and etherealized, and to rise into the blue heaven accompanied by a sweet-smelling savour. Was there not here pictorially portrayed, in the laying of the flesh upon the altar, its presentation to God as a gift, and in the combustion the divine acceptance of the gift?[1]

The last feature of the general ritual to be noticed, is that of the concluding meal, whether it was made by the priesthood, as in the more common cases, or by the laity, as in the peace-offerings. If the act of burning the carcase of the victim was the visible sign of the divine acceptance of the proffered gift, the restoration of part of the gift to priest or people was the divine provision in mercy for human rejoicing in the act of worship. This feast was a call, as every Oriental mind would especially realize, to fellowship and friendship. It prepared the way for joyous reunion. It is the reception, so to speak, of the prodigal who, having returned to his Father, and having been sanctified by atoning blood, is now to be feasted with the fatted calf. It is Jehovah taking the sinner to His house, preparing him a feast, and eating and drinking with him at His table. As has been well said: "Just as the sprinkling blood betokened *justification*, and combustion *sanctification*, so the sacrificial meal told its tale of the *unio mystica*."[2]

Thus, in every animal sacrifice that he offered, the Jew, who by the light of the express teaching of the Law entered into the meaning of his combined act of atonement and worship, would see in the presentation at the Tabernacle a material expression of his desire to approach the Almighty, Who there

[1] Michaelis, *Entwurf der typischen Gottes-gelahrtheit*, § 20; De Maistre, *Soirées de St. Petersbourg*, vol. ii. p. 234, and others, supposed this burning to be a surrender to the punishment of hell. If so, the burning of incense symbolically represented that the Most High met prayer with hell-fire; and the smoke of sacrifice, so frequently described as divinely acceptable, is in reality the smoke of hell! Since the time of Bähr, the opinion in the text has been generally adopted.

[2] Kurtz, *Alttest. Opfercultus*, § 79, p. 133.

revealed himself; in the laying on of the hand, the deliberate dedication of the victim to the purpose of sacrifice; in the aspersion of its blood, the "covering" of his sin before the face of God; in the burning upon the hearth of earth, the acceptance by Jehovah of the presentation made; and, when a meal of any kind succeeded, he would see God his Saviour adding to His merciful reconciliation the privilege of fellowship with Himself.

And in the investigation of the symbolical significance of the several species of animal sacrifice, the essential significance attached to each by the Law was expressly emphasized by sensuous representation. Inasmuch as, whenever a series of sacrifices was presented, the sin-offering always came first, the burnt-offering next, and the peace-offering as the conclusion of the whole,[1] logical connection, as well as the ritualistic details of each sacrifice, suggests that commencement be made with the sin-offering.

The *differentia* of the sin-offering was its purpose of atonement. As a sacrifice it was pre-eminently atoning. Now the leading features of its ritual were, to recapitulate what has been previously recounted at length, that the offerings varied according to the status of the persons presenting them, that the manipulation with the blood of the slaughtered victims was brought into strong relief, and that the fatty portions only of the carcase were burnt upon the altar, the remainder being in some cases burnt without the camp, and in others falling to the priests. Each of these features symbolized in some respect the essential significance of this variety of offering. Thus it followed, from the very nature of the sin-offering, that a more valuable offering should be presented the higher the theocratic status of the offerer; if atonement was to be made by a gift, the sin of the noble must be atoned by a gift more costly than the sin of the poor, the sin of the priest by a more precious gift than the sin of the layman; and the gradation was seen in the she-goat for the Israelites, in the more valuable he-goat for a ruler, and in the yet more valuable ox for the high priest or the entire congregation. Then, again, there was something singularly expres-

[1] See Ex. xxix.; Lev. viii.

sive in the fact that the sin of the priest was to be marked by the cremation of the whole carcase without the camp. In the third place, the burning only of the fatty portions distinctly characterized the general idea of sacrifice by presentation to be subordinate. But it was the ritual with the blood which most clearly indicated the prominence of the atoning element in this sacrifice. Atonement under the Law was atonement by blood, and the special ritual enjoined emphatically asserted the fact. If the burnt-offering culminated in the complete combustion upon the altar, if the peace-offering had its climax in its festal entertainment, and the trespass-offering in the money commutation attached, the acme of the sacrifice in question undeniably lay in the aspersion of blood upon the altar,—the presentation, so to speak, of atoning life before the Lord. Even in the sin-offerings of the lowest rank, the blood was not swung, as in the other offerings, against the four walls of the altar,—was not even sprinkled upon the horns of the altar,—but, a more deliberate and careful method being adopted, was cautiously smeared upon the horns with the finger,[1] "to bring the blood as near as possible to God," as has been expressively said.[2] The same thing was done with the offering for a ruler. In the offering for the congregation or high priest, a yet more solemn course was pursued; for the high priest took the blood into the Holy Place, sprinkled the veil with it seven times, and besmeared the horns of the altar of incense. In every case the surplus blood was not dashed against the altar sides, but carefully poured away at the foot. Without any further elucidation, every detail of the ritual will be readily understood from what has been already said upon the essential and symbolic significance of the Tabernacle, priesthood, and the *modus operandi* of sacrificing. There was not an element in the ritual which did not paint upon the eye what the essential significance imprinted upon the intellect.

By the peculiar ritual of the trespass-offering quite another truth was expressed. Its speciality was a fine associated with the sacrificial ram by the priest, "of shekels of silver, after the shekel of the sanctuary." As has been previously seen,

[1] Lev. v. 7, 18, 25, 30, 34. [2] Oehler, article in Herzog, vol. x. p. 648.

these offerings were made for sins which admitted of restitution or recompense: whether, as in some cases, those sins were infringements of the injunctions concerning the divine dues, when the appropriate restitution was made to God; or, as in others, social relationships had been infringed, and restitution was made to both God and man. The fine added to the ram brought out in firm outline the nature of this sacrifice as a restitution to God; and when restitution was also made to man, the payment of the debt and its superadded fine brought out the same feature with respect to human liability. The remaining ritual had no extraordinary feature. That the trespass-offering was a sacrifice, all the remaining features testified; that it was an atoning sacrifice, the bloody rites bore witness; that it was a sacrifice of the nature of a ransom, this special element of valuation emphasized.

In the burnt and peace offerings we have passed away from the atoning sacrifices *par excellence*, and have come to those sacrifices which were offerings primarily and secondarily atoning. This is very conspicuous in the ritual enjoined for each. There is no special prominence given to the manipulation with the blood, as in the case of the sin-offerings; nor to any fancy valuing, as in that of the offerings for trespass: they are quite other features which are mainly symbolized. Another feature altogether was displayed in the essential significance of the burnt-offering, and to this telling expression was given in the ritual. The burnt-offering was not the offering of petition or confession or communion, but peculiarly the offering of consecration, and this is clearly visible in its symbolism. There was the common process of atonement by blood, but performed with no unusual prominence; the individuality of this variety of offering was seen in the total cremation upon the hearth. How gloriously affecting and reassuring! A sacrifice is made; the Divine Being, all-powerful and all-holy, is worshipped by means of a gift which is a faint and insufficient emblem of self-surrender; the divine fire wholly consumes the offering; and the proffer of self is graciously accepted. As the disparted flesh hissed into smoke, the worshipper knew that his gift had been welcome, that the savour of burning flesh had been a sweet savour to the

Lord. The remaining details of the rite present nothing unusual.

The peace-offerings were offerings *quibus pax cum Deo fertur*. This cementing of the divine friendship was conspicuously evident in the ritual commanded. The presentation, the imposition of the hand, the manipulation with the blood, and the burning of the fatty portions, had the common significance; it was the final meal which was the uncommon element. Two points, however, in the introductory ritual call for elucidation—viz., the *wave-breast* and the *heave-shoulder*. The word translated "wave" is used elsewhere for the movement of an axe,[1] and of a threatening hand;[2] and, quite in harmony with this, the Talmud describes the motion as one that passed backwards and forwards.[3] A peculiarly significant symbol! The swinging forward was manifestly a symbolic presentation to God, a declaration by outward sign that the object waved belonged to Him; the movement backwards was as manifestly a declaration that the Almighty returned as a gift to His priest what actually belonged to Himself. The *heaving* was very similar, taking place, however, upwards and downwards, as if towards the divine dwelling-place in the heavens. "The *heaving* points to God as throned in heaven, the *waving* to God as Lord of earth, as one should say: 'If I ascend into heaven, Thou art there; if I make my bed in Hades, Thou art there.'"[4] But, as has just been pointed out, the essential element in the peace-offerings was the closing feast. How beautifully such a feast reminded the offerers of that fellowship which existed between themselves—yea, between themselves and their families—and the covenant God! As plainly as emblems could speak, it was said, as we have previously expressed, that the Father held high feast with His children.

In the symbolism, therefore, of each of the Mosaic sacrifices of blood, there was, first, an atoning element, and then an expression of some need of the spiritual life. "The burnt-offering, the most ancient and extensive in its import of all, consumed wholly upon the altar, represented the general con-

[1] Isa. x. 15. [2] Isa. xix. 16. [3] Bähr, *Symbolik*, vol. ii. p. 355.
[4] Hengstenberg, *Die Opfer der heiligen Schrift*, p. 42 (*Ecclesiastes*, p. 103).

viction of sinfulness, which was part of the religion of the pious Jew, and the felt duty of a complete surrender of all the powers and faculties to God, Who, notwithstanding the imperfections of His servant, continued to him the privileges of the covenant. In the peace or thank offering under its various forms, the feeling of sin is expressed in connection with particular mercies vouchsafed by, or expected from, God; in accordance with a deep and true sentiment pervading both the Old and New Testaments, that the loving-kindness of God, not less, perhaps more, than His rod of chastisement, awakens in the true Israelite a sense of his own unworthiness. In this species of sacrifice, after atonement is made, man is seen in the enjoyment of perfect fellowship with God; he sits at God's table; he is placed for the time being upon a level with the priests, and with them partakes of the divine bounty. The sin and trespass-offerings had reference to particular sins, by which, though committed inadvertently (for wilful transgression no atonement was provided), fellowship with God had been interrupted, and by sacrificial cleansing must be restored. To all the atoning property belongs: in all the victim is slain, the blood is sprinkled by the priest: and only after this preliminary process, by which the person of the offerer was rendered acceptable, is communion with God enjoyed or recovered." [1]

Having thus sufficiently illustrated for our purpose the symbolic significance of the animal sacrifices, a little space must be bestowed upon a subject which has been intentionally kept out of view,—the symbolic significance of the vegetable or bloodless sacrifices. Of what these consisted details have been given in a preceding chapter.[2] Offerings of the produce of agriculture and wine-growing, the staple employments of Palestine, were alone legitimate; and these offerings always accompanied either burnt or peace offerings, and were themselves accompanied by oil and incense and salt, never by leaven or honey. The fundamental idea of the *minchah* has been seen to lie in the fact that they were sacrifices pure and simple: they were, like all sacrifices, gifts to God, and gifts not only of personal property, but of food acquired in the daily avocation; they differed from other sacrifices in being

[1] Litton, *The Mosaic Dispensation*, pp. 97, 98. [2] See pp. 81–83.

peculiarly representative of the toil of the offerer. In this aspect the remarks upon the *minchah* by one of the latest investigators of Mosaic sacrifice (who, nevertheless, has not escaped the toils of the rationalistic symbolism of Germany) may be profitably perused. "Animals," he says, "of the higher class, more especially domestic animals and cattle, stand incomparably nearer to man than plants do; their life rests upon the same psychico-corporeal basis; they are subject to the same conditions of life, they have the same bodily functions and organs, and need the same corporeal food as man. All this is wanting in the plant,—or rather, everything in it is precisely the opposite. An animal, therefore, is far better adapted to represent the person of a man, his vital organs, powers, and actions, than plants can ever be. On the other hand, the cultivation of plants, more especially the growing of corn, requires far more of preparatory, continuous, and subsequent labour of man, and is more dependent upon him than the rearing of cattle. The material acquired by agriculture, therefore, was more suitable than the flocks to represent the *fruit* or the result of the life-work of man."[1] That these bloodless offerings always accompanied blood-offerings,[2] is readily understood from the Mosaic principle that Jehovah could receive nothing from man, unless atonement had first been made by the shedding of blood; that they never accompanied sin or trespass offerings follows from the essential significance of those offerings. Oil and salt were mingled with the varieties of meal, in harmony with the common symbolism of those things,—the former, to show that without a special consecration no offering could be acceptable; and the latter, "the salt of the covenant of thy God,"[3] to symbolize the divine compact by the terms of which presentations might be made. Incense was also added, according to the invariable symbolism, to represent the prayers of the offerer which were to rise as a sweet-smelling savour. Leaven and honey, on the other hand, were rigidly excluded because of their fermenting and

[1] Kurtz, *Alttest. Opfercultus*, § 24, p. 42 (Eng. Trans. p. 63).

[2] The exception in Lev. v. 11 is only apparent. That offering was not a meat-offering, but a very exceptional sin-offering.

[3] Lev. ii. 13.

destructive qualities—so fitting an emblem of the tendency to degeneration incident to humanity. The *minchah* of the Holy Place will be readily understood from the significance of that place as the priestly sanctuary. As the Israelite, therefore, added to his animal offerings at the altar in the Court those of meal and wine, he would see visibly expressed the giving of his substance as well as himself to the Lord; and as those offerings rose in smoke, he would know—now that atonement had been previously made by the aspersed blood—that, free as they were from the old leaven of sin and wickedness, sanctioned as they were by the salt of the covenant, accompanied as they were by the oil of consecration and the incense of prayer, these products of steady human toil were acceptable to God. As, too, the priest presented in the Holy Place the shew-bread and the oil and the incense, he would be reminded that for him animal blood as an indispensable preliminary was unnecessary, and that his offerings were graciously permitted to be the incense of prayer, the light of a consecrated life, and that holy bread, which, having been solemnly presented to Joseph, would be received back by himself consecrated and blessed. A similar symbolic significance, and a similar illustration of the essential significance by expressive emblems, was visible in the remaining bloodless offerings of the Old Testament. It was just the same fact of human surrender to God which appeared in outward form in the voluntary offerings for the construction of the Tabernacle and the attire of the priesthood, in the tithes, in the firstlings of fruits and cattle, and in the several vows which were voluntarily made to God. "The burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, in which the unity of the soul with God is expressed, find their parallels in the gifts, the firstlings, the first-born, the tithes, the shew-bread, the eternal fire on the altar of burnt-offerings, the daily and festal burning of incense, the washings before every sacred act of prayer or sacrifice, and in the vows of the Nazarite and the Rechabite; in all these things the desire is expressed to authenticate by outward acts the readiness to surrender oneself unreservedly to God."[1]

[1] Tholuck, *Das A. T. in N. T.*, 6th ed. p. 87.

Not many words will be required to illustrate the symbolical significance of the *sacrificial times and seasons.* The ordinary daily sacrifices have been already sufficiently explained in the preceding section. The one feature that requires elucidation is the connection of the extraordinary sacrifices with the several festal times,—the employment, that is to say, of sacrificial ritual to symbolically intensify the essential significance of those times. Even of this point a very brief examination will suffice. With a beautiful adaptation, the sacrifices enjoined for the several extraordinary days of the Jewish calendar were specially adapted to express the essential significance of those days. For example, the thought that was uppermost in connection with the several Sabbatic times (viz. the Sabbath, the New-moon, and the Sabbatic Month) was the recognition of God as the Creator of the heavens and the earth,—of Jehovah Elohim; the thought which was expressed by the several more precisely festal times (viz. the Passover, the Feast of the First-fruits, and the Feast of Tabernacles) was the recognition not of Elohim, but of Jehovah, the covenant God of Israel; whilst the great Day of Atonement was the distinct recognition of God as the Saviour and Sanctifier. After what has been previously said, the reader will readily see how beautifully these several ideas were symbolically expressed by the requisite sacrifices.

To deepen, however, the sense of the exquisite fitness displayed by this adaptation of rite to doctrine, let a few words be bestowed upon the imposing and solemn ceremonial of the Day of Atonement. That was the day when there was granted to the chosen people the assurance of the divine forgiveness for all those sins of thought and word and deed which still accompanied even their highest and truest acts of worship. So important was the day to the religious life of the Jew, that the Rabbis in later times called the Day of Atonement THE DAY, as if it absorbed as well as represented every other day in the calendar. The day was solemnly set apart as a day of complete cessation from labour and abstinence from food; not a hammer was to be heard or bargain driven under pain of death, not a form of food was to be prepared or eaten under the same dread penalty; the earthly

appetites were to be restrained most rigidly, and solemn preparations made in body and soul to experience the awfulness of sin and the ecstasy of forgiveness. The high service commenced by a solemn purification by blood of the high priest and the Tabernacle—yea, of all the paraphernalia, human and material, of the Mosaic worship; for "holy" as all were called "to the Lord," by the demands of the law they must be none the less cleansed. How significant the fact, and how expressive the process! The high priest, now but a man, and without official dignity, must lay aside his official costume of blue and gold and jewels, and in a dress of pure white, without even the adjunct of the parti-coloured girdle of the common priesthood, approach the holy fane. He bathed his entire body, as well as his feet and hands (which sufficed on ordinary occasions of ministration) at the laver, and then presented himself with a bullock for a sin-offering for himself and his house, two goats for a sin-offering for the people, and a ram for a burnt-offering before the brazen altar. Yes, the high priest, clad in imputed righteousness, the chosen servant of Jehovah, anointed with oil above his fellows, must be washed with pure water and further purified by blood. The bullock is duly slain, the goat is duly slain, and the blood of both is sprinkled with impressive rites, with the anxious and prayerful prostration of the entire congregation, upon the altar and floor of the Holy of Holies, upon the altar of the Holy Place, and upon the altar of burnt-offering. So the truth was presented to the eye that atoning blood had been shed, had been presented before the very throne of God, only visible to the arch-officiator on this high day, and had been subsequently sprinkled upon the appropriate places of worship for priests and high priest and people. So, by awful ceremony and eloquent ritual, the truth was uttered in the hearing and to the faculties of all, that atonement had been made in the divinely appointed way for every section of the elect nation. Then the reality of the divine forgiveness was symbolically conveyed. In how vivid a manner! The live goat still remaining is brought before the altar, and the high priest, placing his two hands upon its head, "confessed over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions

in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat;"[1] and all the sins of the nation having thus been symbolically transferred, the goat was led away by a suitable messenger into the wilderness, the abode of Azazel. In later times the goat was conducted along a prepared pathway, amidst the execrations of the multitudes assembled, to the wilderness, and there driven headlong from a rock and killed. Whether the destruction of the goat formed any part of the earlier ritual, we have no evidence for deciding. Thus, before the eyes of the people, their sins were borne away for ever to him who was the father of sin. The rites of atonement for himself, his house, the holy places, and the people ended, the high priest resumed his official vestments, and offered the ram for a burnt-offering, consecrating himself anew to the divine service; afterwards any offerings of the assembled people were slain and presented. But for the fact that such a ceremony must be repeated "year by year continually," what a fund was there in this annual feast for thought, for gratitude, and for humble recognition of the divine goodness!

[1] Lev. xvi. 21.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SACRAMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MOSAIC INJUNCTIONS.

"It is as if there were a cross unseen, standing on its undiscovered hill, far back in the ages, out of which were sounding always just the same deep voice of suffering love and patience that was heard by mortal ears from the sacred hill of Calvary."—BUSHNELL, *The Vicarious Sacrifice*, p. 31.

IT will have occurred to the reader of the preceding pages that the Mosaic Sacrifices might be divided into two classes, according to the purposes which impelled their presentation,—whether, on the one hand, the motive was a sense of sin, or, on the other, a feeling of grateful self-surrender. It will also have occurred to the student of the Comparative Science of Religion, as a peculiarity of the Levitical cultus, that even this twofold division is not logically tenable, inasmuch as the eucharistic offerings themselves were also by their own or by their accompanying rites atoning. According to the Sinaitic injunctions, it was illegal for the populace to approach the Holy Places under any circumstances whatever without a visible recognition of sin, and the Holy Places were themselves unclean until their impurity had been atoned by the sprinkling of blood. Now, what was the significance of that atonement without which every sacrifice, even of praise and self-consecration, was sinful, every priest unholy, every sacred place carnal and unclean? This question, but briefly answered as yet, requires fuller and more sequential illustration than it has hitherto received.

Again it is necessary to remark that we must not, lest we invalidate the method previously pursued, overstep the bounds of the early Jewish thought. Educated in the conception of Christianity, and enjoying the advantage of its clearer light, there is needed both an exercise of restraint to put aside our

Christian beliefs, and a difficult constructive effort, a laborious sympathetic synthesis, to revivify the intellectual and religious views of those whose only monitor was the substance of the Pentateuch. Nevertheless, it is to sin against truth, as well as to miss the invaluable lesson of history, either to ignore or misrepresent the several stages of religious development. The aim of this chapter is to bring into strong relief, in the first place, the relations of the rites of Mosaism to the forgiveness of sin, and, in the second place, the relation of the same rites to the general religious life ; or, if it be allowable to introduce the theological distinctions of later times, it is our present aim to elicit the *justifying* and *sanctifying* relations of the Mosaic sacrifices.

The former of these questions may be stated thus : What is the significance and import of that *atonement* of which mention is so frequently made in the Torah ? What is that atonement in itself ? how was it effected ? whom did it concern ? was the effect produced permanent or transitory, once for all, or day by day and year by year ? In any treatise which pretends to deal with ancient Jewish sacrifice, some space must be given to the nature, method, extent, and efficacy of the atonement wrought.

Upon the sense attached in the law to the word *atonement*, nothing more needs be said. The idea expressed by the Hebrew original of the word translated *atone* was *cover* and *covering*, not in the sense of *rendering invisible to Jehovah*, but in the sense of *engrossing His sight with something else*, of *neutralizing sin*, so to speak, of *disarming it*, of *rendering it inert to arouse the righteous anger of God*. To *atone sin* in the Hebrew conception was *so to cover it over that God could neglect it*. "To atone (literally, to cover up) does not mean to cause a sin not to have been committed, for that is impossible ; nor to represent it as non-existent, for that would be opposed to the earnest spirit of the Law ; nor to pay for and compensate it by any act ; but to cover it before God—that is, to deprive it of its power to come between us and God." [1]

One feature of the method by which the Law asserted atonement could be affected, is sufficiently evident after the

[1] Kahnis, *Die Lutherische Dogmatik historisch dargestellt*, 1861, vol. i. p. 271.

two preceding chapters; that feature was the correct manipulation of animal blood, correctness depending on an obedient adherence to an appointed ritual, eminently adapted to express symbolically that the life of a victim physically immaculate was vicariously bearing the punishment of death due to the offerer; or, if we ignore altogether the pathetic symbolism of the ritual (the words of the Law being precise, that atonement was effected for human sin by the effusion of animal blood), loudly eloquent of the fact that life had been atoned by life, blood by blood. The sin of the Jew was neutralized when the blood of his sacrifice touched the altar.

If the question be asked, by way of discrediting the invariableness of this objective element in the forgiveness of sins, whether the Law did not recognise other objective and even subjective means of atonement, the reply must be in the affirmative, but the inference must be denied. It is true that the Law does speak of atonement by other means than the effusion of sacrificial blood. Whenever a census was taken of the tribes, every Israelite was bidden give half a shekel, neither more nor less,—"the rich shall not give more, and the poor shall not give less,"—*to make an atonement for their souls.*[1] So, when the warriors returned from the sanguinary slaughter of the Midianites and numbered their forces, they gave of their spoils—their bracelets, their earrings, their golden chains —*to atone for their souls.*[2] In both of these instances the express words of the Pentateuch assert that atonement was made by a payment in gold or money of the estimated value of the life. Sometimes religious acts are described as *atoning.* The day after the melancholy death of Korah and his company, Moses bade Aaron avert the plague, which was beginning, by waving incense from the Holy Place amongst the congregation, saying: "Take a censer . . . *make an atonement for them* . . . there is wrath gone out from the Lord."[3] Nor would one forget in this connection the affair of the golden calf, when Moses, deeply moved at the popular transgression, betook himself to the Lord with his "peradventure I shall *make an atonement* for your sin."[4] In the former case, again,

[1] Ex. xxx. 11–16.
[2] Num. xxxi. 48–54.
[3] Num. xvi. 46.
[4] Ex. xxxii. 30.

human sin was *covered* by priestly intercession, in the latter by the prayer of a righteous man. These facts are indisputable, not so the inferences from them. However weighty such statements are in the discussion of the efficacy of sacrificial atonement (and we shall give them their due weight presently), they do not invalidate the conclusion that the objective method appointed under the Law for the remission of sins was that of animal sacrifice. For a Jew or a Jewish priest to rely on prayer or a presentation of money to achieve the forgiveness of sins, would be for him to contravene what he regarded as the direct command of God. It is indisputable, that although, in certain cases which it itself dictated, the Law recognised other means of atonement, and by its perpetual approbation of the deeds of Moses regarded it as possible that one endowed with the prophetic office should himself be above the law, nevertheless the only method to which recourse could be had at any time for purification and absolution was the legal offering of animal life.

But the Law also recognised a subjective as well as objective constituent in the method of atonement, and this objective element requires emphasis. It does not consist with the statements of the Pentateuch to assert that, "although page after page in the Books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy is filled with ceremonial directions, there is not a word to remind the man who has brought his sin-offering to the priest, that the atoning efficacy of the sacrifice will depend either on his penitence or his faith."[1] No doubt the subjective features of the Mosaic worship are more or less latent,—it was one of the purposes of that worship to arouse rather than to demand the accompaniment of religious feeling; none the less, that there were subjective conditions of acceptable sacrifice for sin, is abundantly evident. Mosaism would have been a retrogression indeed, if its approved ideal of divine service was a mechanical obedience which made no demands upon the spiritual nature, and was equally efficacious whether performed with the whole heart or without any heart at all. Passing by, however, as an anachronism at this stage of our inquiry, the argument of the apostle, that "he was a

[1] Dale, *The Jewish Temple and Christian Church*, p. 273.

Jew who was one inwardly," and not even pausing to insist that if the Mosaic sacrifices were unaccompanied by "penitence" or "faith," the very motive of symbolism is denied, it will suffice to demonstrate that the Pentateuch does clearly acknowledge that the potency of its worship in some degree depended upon the mental attitude of the worshipper. The priests were to approach their sacred functions with their faculties unaffected by excess.[1] On the destruction of Nadab and Abihu by fire, Moses saw a sufficient excuse for Aaron's neglect of official duty in his spiritual unpreparedness.[2] Referring to the sacrifices offered by individuals, many were voluntary, and the will of the offerer must therefore have been taken into account.[3] With respect to the sin-offerings, they were commanded to be made when sins came to the offerer's knowledge,[4]—it must have been a singular knowledge which prompted obedience without kindling a spark of regret. On the Day of Atonement, the rigid command was made that all should "humble their souls,"[5] that is, outwardly fast and inwardly bow in repentance, the penalty being appended to the command, that "whosoever shall not be bowed in that same day, that soul shall be cut off from among his people." Then, it is significant that for open rebellion against God, for sins done with a high hand and in wilful rejection of the divine authority, there was no atonement possible under the Law.[6] Rabbinic tradition has even maintained that, whenever an offerer laid his hand upon the head of any victim he was about to slaughter, he audibly confessed, as Outram translates: "Obsecro, Domine, peccavi, deliqui, rebellavi, hoc et illud feci, nunc autem pœnitentiam ago, sitque (hostia) hæc expiatio mea;"—"I implore Thee, O Lord, I have sinned, I have gone astray, I have rebelled, I have done so and so, but

[1] Lev. x. 9.
[2] Lev. x. 16–20.
[3] Lev. vii. 16.
[4] Lev. iv. 14, 23, 28.
[5] Lev. xvi. 29, 30, xxiii. 27, 29, 33; Num. xxix. 7.
[6] Num. xv. 30, 31. What is meant by sinning with a high hand is thus paraphrased by Maimonides, *Moreh Nevochim*, Pt. III. cap. xli.: "He sins with a high hand who casts off shame and sins openly. Such a person transgresses the law, not merely because he is hurried into forbidden things by the impulse of his unbridled passions and corrupt desires, but because he denies the authority of the law, and determines to openly resist it."

now I repent, and let this be my atonement."[1] At any rate, there is the testimony of the law itself that confession of sins accompanied various expiatory offerings;[2] and Moses, who gave the ritual injunctions, dwelt as fully as any moral teacher could desire upon the necessity of moral as well as ceremonial service.[3] Further, there is no reason to conclude that the assembled worshippers did anything unusual when they accompanied Zacharias' priestly offering of incense by their prayers.[4] An interesting scene in this connection, which may be mentioned here, although related in a post-Pentateuchal book, took place in the war of extermination against the Benjamites: At first the children of Israel went up to the house of God and asked counsel: they were defeated; then they went up and wept and asked counsel: they were again defeated; a third time the whole nation wept, sat before the Lord for hours continuously, fasted, offered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings: then, both objective and subjective conditions being complete, success attended their arms.[5] But, as has previously been said, although such facts as have been mentioned unquestionably point to the necessity of objective elements in availing sacrifice,[6] that necessity is rather latent in the Law than expressly stated. Further, insist though the Law undoubtedly did by letter and spirit upon the necessity of approaching God Most High with penitence and faith and hope, the teaching of prophets and holy men, as will be seen later on, intervened between the giving of the Law and the proclamation of the Gospel, for the very purpose of urgently pressing the end of the subjective side.[7]

But to what extent did the Mosaic sacrifices atone? What

[1] Outram, *De Sacrificiis*, Dissert. i. p. 170.

[2] Lev. v. 5; Num. v. 7.

[3] *E.g.* Deut. vi. 4, 5, x. 12, 13.

[4] Luke i. 10.

[5] Judg. xx. 18–48. Compare Hengstenberg, *Geschichte des Reiches Gottes unter dem Alt. Bundes*, 2nd period, Part III. § 3 (translated in *Foreign Theological Library*, vol. ii. pp. 17, 18).

[6] "The Old Testament Scriptures nowhere teach that sacrifices are acceptable to God without reference to the disposition of the offerer."—Hofmann, *Der Schriftbeweis*, vol. ii. p. 215. To which testimony may be added this of Steudel, *Vorlesungen über die Theologie des A. T.*: "The objective side (*das Aeussere*) itself became extinct when the subjective (*das Innere*) failed; or, if the objective side simply was observed, it made its inadequacy sensible enough."

[7] Compare Kalisch, *Leviticus*, Essay A. x. 4, on the verbal utterances which accompanied the imposition of hands in sacrifice.

was the degree of validity which they possessed in the divine government? Having seen what they were as means of justification, and how they were supposed to work that spiritual state, what was the justification so supposed and wrought? Two very opposite views have been propounded upon this point. On the one hand, it has been asserted that the atonement wrought by the Mosaic sin-offerings neutralized the ill effects of all sin, moral as well as ceremonial, so long as sacrifice was presented without that open defiance against God which was a sufficient proof that there was no real faith in the heart, and produced the remission of sins as efficaciously as the blood of Christ did in the economy of the New Testament. On the other hand, the opinion has been advanced by many, that the fulfilment of the sacrificial law had no power to remove the ill effects of moral, but simply of ceremonial offences, and of some few slighter cases of moral transgression specially excepted for particular reasons. It is but a modification of the former view if it is declared that sin was not removed once for all by any sacrifice under the law, but simply for a time,—say from the interval of one sin-offering to another, or from one day of atonement to another. According to the one view, the legal sin-offerings were divinely appointed means of obtaining a forgiveness of sins, which would be regarded as valid in the eternal counsels of Jehovah; according to the other, a forgiveness of sins valid alone in His temporary earthly government. The former opinion regarded the atonement as reinstating the Jew in his position as an adopted child of God; the latter, as reinstating him in his position as a citizen. It is possible for these two opposite views to be so stated as to be, as in many another warmly debated controversy, very much the same, a reinstatement in the earthly theocracy being identical in the Mosaic dispensation with a reinstatement in the theocracy of heaven. Still, since either view, when carried to an extreme, leads into considerable error,—the one tending to regard the Jewish system of sacrifice, as does the Arminian theology, as possessing as powerful an operation in the divine government as the sacrifice of Christ; and the other, as having no power beyond restoring an offender by an analogous ceremony to the payment of a fine or penalty in modern law, to

the civil status from which he had been outlawed by his crime, —we must precisely state what the Law itself regarded as the effect wrought by its sin-offerings.

The first criticism which suggests itself with respect to the two opinions just quoted is that, however convenient the distinction between the moral and ceremonial laws may be in a classification of the numerous statutes, such a distinction is unknown to the Law itself. To argue from any such distinction, is to argue from a mere human arrangement of the code. In the Mosaic law, what we are accustomed to regard as ceremonial acts are considered as in the truest and deepest sense moral acts, and the temporary government of God as a necessary section of His eternal government. In its esteem, a breach of its commands is so fearful as to be visited by hereditary punishment; and even an unconscious breaking of its commands is so far from venial that it incapacitated the transgressors for acceptable worship, and, if unrecognised by a suitable sacrifice when the transgressor became conscious of his error, was to be visited by excision and death. To speak of a ceremonial atonement for a ceremonial offence, meaning by ceremonial something that was a ceremony and nothing more, is foreign to the teaching of Mosaism. "Such a division of the law into ceremonial and moral, however familiar to us, can at any rate be nowhere established from the law, which, indeed, has received into the fundamental code of the decalogue the ceremonial command as to the observance of the Sabbath."[1]

And when we turn to the Law to see what it considered to be the effects of sacrifices which were offered for sin, or for that inherited original sin which is called uncleanness, we find that the effects are always stated to be the *forgiveness of sins* and the *removal of uncleanness*.[2] To purify oneself by sacrifice as enjoined, was to remove the curse of that guilt which was operative in our very bodies as death and disease: to atone for any transgression in the legal form, was to obtain the forgiveness of that transgression. The conscience which was oppressed with sinfulness or special sin, was assured that

[1] Tholuck, *Das Alte Test. im Neuen Test.*, Part II. § 3, p. 91.
[2] See pp. 95-97.

its sin was removed. And the reality of the forgiveness vouchsafed may be seen by turning to the actual catalogue of sins which are expressly enumerated as having been forgiven. All sins of frailty and inconsiderateness were atoned by the sin-offerings, whether they were done knowingly or unwittingly;[1] by the trespass-offering such sins as lying, theft, fraud, perjury, debauchery, were atoned;[2] and, coming to the great Day of Atonement, forgiveness was then obtained for the transgressions of the children of Israel in all their sins.[3] For sins done with a high hand alone was no atonement provided, attention being called, as we have previously said, by such a provision to the necessity of obedience as well as sacrifice. Recurring, therefore, to the etymology of the word *atone*, it may be said—declaring for neither of the opinions discussed—that all sins for which offerings had been legally made were "covered,"—that is to say, were not *obliterated*, but by some means *rendered powerless to arouse the divine judicial anger*.

But by what means? The question arises as to what the Mosaic law regarded as the actual instrument of procuring the forgiveness of sins? Wherein, in other words, lay the potency of that blood which "covered"? Did it "cover" by its inherent power, or did its efficacy lie in some valid sacrifice which it foreshadowed, and to which it pointed? The Law gives no direct replies. It arouses the mind by many a piece of inconsequent reasoning; it seems to suggest a possible solution of the difficulty in the far future; it tells a mystic and eluding tale to the imaginative and spiritually-minded; but it has no express statement to be read of all, and mastered almost without preparation. The time was not yet come when the grace and truth of the Gospel should accompany the grace and truth of the Law. If, then, we ask ourselves how the Jew believed it possible that animal blood could atone sin, we are compelled to admit that the probability is that the majority who craved atonement rested simply in an unquestioning obedience to the revealed laws. Further, were there here and there amongst the unreasoning mass of worshippers one more pious and speculative than the rest, there would be no difficulty to such an one as to the subjective conditions of sacri-

[1] Lev. iv. and v. 1-13. [2] Lev. vi. 1-7. [3] Lev. xvi. 16, 30, 34.

fice; it would seem appropriate that penitence should precede an alleviation of the consequences of guilt. But what would he make of the objective conditions of sacrifice? He might well ask himself with Cato, "*Moritur cur victima pro me?*" How comes it that forgiveness depends upon the blood of an innocent animal, not only unsinning and unrepentant, but incapable of moral feeling of any kind? Nor would the explanation that "the blood atones through the soul"[1] be a sufficient solution of his difficulty. The sacrifice of his own soul might, in his belief, faintly atone for what he had done; but it was incomprehensible that the soul of an unintelligent, unconsenting animal should be a valid substitute. To the question that agitated his mind, he could return no other direct reply than this, that "so God had willed." That repentance was an insufficient atonement was clear enough, that the insufficiency of repentance was supplied by animal sacrifice was also clear; but, in order to explain how this shedding of blood became an adequate complement, there was no resource but the words of the Sinaitic revelation: "I have *given*" the blood "to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls."[2] Should he desire to penetrate further into these divine mysteries, two courses were open to him. If he were acquainted with the modern habit of criticising and pronouncing upon the divine declarations, he might refuse to have anything to do for his part with such a God; or if, on the other hand, he distrusted his own judgment in the consciousness of the lack of some of the most important data, he might maintain an attitude of humble suspension of judgment, and set himself to discover some reason underlying this divine revelation. What the result of his inquiry would be, we have no means of ascertaining. It might have been that, as the patriarchs probably did, he coupled this spiritual deliverance by sacrifice with the tale of a deliverer so familiar from the promises made to his fathers. Indeed, the early prophecies had been expanded during his own days, for a Balaam had spoken of a star and a sceptre which should go forth from Israel;[3] and Moses had foretold a coming prophet like himself, who should be qualified by obedience as well as audience.[4]

[1] Lev. xvii. 11. [2] Lev. xvii. 11. [3] Num. xxiv. 17. [4] Deut. xviii. 15.

At any rate, there was sufficient to convince him that his was a preparatory dispensation, and that, as a wise man, his course was to be thankful for the present and eagerly await the future;—but we are forestalling our next chapter. In examining into the rationale rather than into the actual efficacy of the atonement wrought by legal obedience, there was much that called for implicit trust in the divine power and mercy, and but a little which spoke to the inquirer of the manner in which that power and mercy really worked.

Now, in the words of the Augsburg Confession, "a *sacrifice* is something given to God in adoration: anything in which God grants to us what His love has promised is a *sacrament*."[1] Adopting, therefore, this convenient theological distinction, it may be said that the nature of the relation between the atoning sacrifices of Mosaism and the forgiveness of sins was *sacramental*. When the Law offered to the Jew forgiveness for his sins by the slaughter of some domestic animal, or by the presentation of a mere handful of meal, it was not that these gifts achieved by their inherent merit the spiritual results which followed; it was that they were sacraments as well as sacrifices, and proclaimed on the house-tops what had already been whispered in the ear: "I the Lord *have given* you this blood upon the altar to make atonement for your souls."[2]

It further remains to investigate the bearings of the residuary section of the sacrificial ritual upon the religious life of the offerers. Here, again, the sacramental nature of these rites comes to the front. It was not alone that the sacrifices of the Law in all their variety became by the mercy of God, and not by any works of their own, the channels of assurance of the divine forgiveness; but these very sacrifices also became by the same mercy, and not by any inherent power, the channels of every spiritual blessing. As in the Patriarchal Age, so in

[1] "Sacrificium est opus quod nos Deo reddimus ut eum honore afficiamus; sacramentum opus, in quo nobis exhibet Deus hoc quod offert promissio."

[2] It was the great merit of the work of Sartorius, *Ueber den Alt. und Neutestamentlichen Cultus*, to have dwelt with commendable force upon the sacramental character of Old Testament sacrifice (see especially pp. 51–59).

the age immediately succeeding, sacrifice was the one appointed means of access to the Father, to which the son, who was ever beneath the parental roof, as well as the returning prodigal, had glad recourse. Indeed, the distinguishing feature of the Mosaic faith was not that its predecessor preached a method of worship fundamentally different, and different in details, but that the Mosaic faith, remaining the same in principle, excelled its forerunner just in the matter of detail. So it happened that, by this later sacrificial worship also, ample provision was made for all the spiritual needs of the Jew. Whatever the feeling with which he regarded the God of his salvation, the expression of that feeling the worship of his people adequately supplied. Exquisitely adapted, indeed, to the deeper and more persistent needs of the spiritual nature of man was this Sinaitic worship. It added to the forgiveness of special sins by allaying that all-pervading sense of sin which is the lot of man; it satisfied the desire so deeply rooted in the heart to do something to attain salvation; it met half way the yearning for a filial relationship with the Father of Spirits; it granted an assurance of the communion of God with man, as well as of the communion of man with God; it sanctified self-surrender; it atoned momentary defection; under its sacrificial teaching the beautiful blossom of spiritual desire bore the rich fruit of spiritual satisfaction. The corn-field, by the presentation of first-fruits, became the corn-field of the Lord; the children in every home, as the first-born was ransomed, were the acknowledged gifts of God; not a Passover but told its tale in the family, not a festival but had its message for the nation: there was, in short, not a vocation or event in life which this sacrificial worship could not hallow by its sacramental opulence. Of course it does not follow that what the laws of Moses could do, that they necessarily did: upon the exact influence produced upon the conscience of each worshipper, it is impossible to pronounce. It is of the very nature of a sacrament to affect different minds with varying intensity. It is perfectly clear that by the offering of the appropriate sacrifices, the Israelite who had by disobedience or neglect forfeited or ignored his theocratic privileges, was restored to those

privileges, his offerings of atonement making restitution for his errors, and those of consecration enabling him to participate in the advantages of the Covenant; it is also clear that the public offerings of atonement and consecration effected for the nation what the private offerings did for individuals. Apparently, too, whenever a sin or trespass offering was brought, the sense of forgiveness would be felt for the special sin which prompted application for forgiveness, and whenever a burnt or peace offering was presented the sense of acceptance or fellowship was felt for a time at least; apparently, also, the public offerings would impart a general sense of security from the divinely-announced anger against wrong-doing. Thus it would appear that a faith which was transient and blind, and which neither demanded nor received satisfaction in the reason, was the special privilege of the Jew. On the other hand, unless it blended with its knowledge something more than the sacrifices themselves conveyed, the faith of the Jew, deep and fervent although it might be in the mercy and wisdom of Jehovah, could never reach that stage when faith became that higher trust which rested at once upon the knowledge possessed of God and upon a satisfied reason—a faith perfect "as pertaining to the consciousness."[1] What knowledge the Jew possessed of a future world as dependent upon the present, or of a future existence at all, it is also impossible to decide; and, as a consequence, it is impossible to decide what sense of an immortal life was fostered by the national worship. Without endorsing the premises of the famous argument of Warburton, his conclusion may, however, be accepted in a sense: the truth would seem to be that, by means of an eminently suggestive religious and political education, the Almighty was arousing within the minds of the religiously inclined thoughts intangible and incontrovertible upon the eternal life. As has been truly said: "The typical conception of the Old Testament has a wider rule than is commonly recognised."[2] The Law educated and expressed the spiritual life.

[1] Heb. ix. 9.

[2] Tholuck, *Das Alte Test. im Neuen Test.*, Part I. § 3, p. 29. Compare Davidson, *On Prophecy*, pp. 88 and 93; and Payne Smith, *Prophecy a*

An answer may now be returned to the question with which we commenced the second chapter of this part, as to what it was possible for the pious Jew to comprehend concerning the purpose of the complicated and manifold cultus ordained at Sinai. Approaching the Law with a heart burdened and perplexed by all the reticulated spiritual ramifications of alienation from God, he would see in its injunctions a partial solution of the great problem of sacrifice. He would be able to see that, by obedience to the several prescriptions of the Law, it was possible to some extent to offer acceptable sacrifices to God. He was not permitted, it was true, to come directly into the divine presence as of old, but he was permitted a certain approach in the ordained ceremonial. The tabernacle, the priesthood, and the sacrificial rubric would be understood to be divine replies to the spiritual cravings of his soul. And each section of the prescribed injunctions would deliver its individual burden of instruction. In the Tabernacle he would recognise the place where the Most High would meet His people under prescribed conditions, and with assured results. In the priesthood he would behold the chosen ministers of God, at once the flower of the religious life of his nation and the pledge of his personal religious destiny. In the wide range of purification and sacrifices, he would acknowledge a diversified series of religious services eminently adapted to arouse and satisfy all the necessities of his spirit, since they embodied in outward form, in addition to those two universal principles of worship,—the general desire for forgiveness, and the desire for adoration,—now confession of special sins and now thanksgiving, at one time a renewed consecration of body, soul, and spirit, and at another a penitent restitution of things in which God or man had been defrauded. In the several festivals he would also allow that Jehovah had provided for many a pause in his secular life, when, in blended humiliation and rejoicing, he might call upon the name of the Lord, and mingle his voice with the national abasement or exaltation. All these rites and cere-

Preparation for Christ, p. 210: "Moses did not clearly teach the Israelites the doctrine of a future judgment and of an eternal state of rewards and punishments. He did set it forth typically."

monies had been revealed to him, he was aware, as a detailed series of sacraments, which, weak as they were through their materialism,[1] yet brought heaven to earth, and transported man, as it were, to the dwelling-place of God. Nor could he miss the significance of these injunctions; for that significance was directly revealed in the Law itself, and, eye aiding mind, was rendered peculiarly impressive by an elaborate and eloquent symbolism.

[1] Rom. viii. 3: ἐν ᾧ ἠσθένει διὰ τῆς σαρκός, etc.

CHAPTER V.

THE TYPICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MOSAIC INJUNCTIONS.

"Si la loi et les sacrifices sont la vérité, il faut qu'ils plaisent à Dieu, et qu'ils ne lui déplaisent point. S'ils sont figures, il faut qu'ils plaisent et déplaisent. Or, dans toute l'Ecriture, ils plaisent et déplaisent."—PASCAL, *Pensées, Des Figures.*

IN the essential, symbolic, and sacramental significance of the Mosaic injunctions, the pious Jew would be rejoiced to find much of the meaning clear of the revelation made to him by the instrumentality of Moses, and sufficient at all events to allay mental inquiry in the ordinary conditions of life. His was a religion divinely given, divinely interpreted, and divinely accredited, which therefore differed *toto cælo* from the religions of heathendom, however similar their method, however analogous their symbolism. But when the currents of life ran more deeply and silently, and meditation upon the causes of things invaded more subtle and unusual spheres, would the same inward satisfaction be felt? In such moments the Tabernacle remained the dwelling-place of God, the priesthood was as truly the divine executive, the sacrifices were then as ever the divinely appointed media of divine approach; but facts will not always satisfy (and are very apt to lose their cogency) unless their causes are apparent, and the question might be reasonably asked, how such things as metal and wood, meal and cattle, became instruments of mercy in the divine hands? What virtue did these things possess, that they were endowed with a sacramental efficacy? This Tabernacle, what was it in the ultimate resort but a structure of wood and skin ornamented? This priesthood, wherein lay the validity of its imputed holiness, and its right of exclusive service? These sacrifices of flesh and fowl, these purifications of water and blood, how came they to be availing with

Him, Whose were all the beasts of the forest, and Who created the sea? Granted even that these material things became sacramentally spiritual by the will of God, was there no ultimate reason for this voluntary selection on the part of Deity? In spite of all the advance that has already been made towards a solution of the problem of Mosaic sacrifice, there was a fundamental difficulty, which has not yet been touched, in the reconciliation of the two facts so patent in the Law—of the spirituality of the Jehovah whom the Jew knew and served, and of the materialism of that worship which that same Jehovah had imparted and enjoined. What solution was it possible for the Jew to obtain of this further difficulty?

Just this,—the solution that naturally followed the knowledge of the *transitory nature of Mosaism.* "The learned researches of modern times have made it more than probable that the religions of antiquity were all symbolical in character, or so framed as to convey under sensible images the ideas on which they were respectively based; but no one would think of calling the rites of heathenism types: they were a species of acted hieroglyphics which reached the understanding through the senses, and here their use terminated."[1] The Jewish sacrificial rites, on the contrary, stood out in clear relief from all other ancient or modern symbolical ceremonies, just by this one fact, that they had a reference not simply to truths imparted at the time of their announcement, but to other truths also which were to be subsequently imparted. The religion of Sinai was *typical* as well as *symbolical.*[2]

Many have objected to the theological doctrine of *types* for the most part for one of two reasons. On the one hand, a severe reprimand has been delivered for departing from the scriptural sense of the word *type,* and giving it a technical sense of its

[1] Litton, *The Mosaic Dispensation,* pp. 82, 83.

[2] Compare Outram, *De Sacrificiis,* Dissert. i. cap. xviii.: "The term *symbol* is equally applicable to that which represents a thing past, present, or future; whereas the object represented by a *type* is invariably future. So that all the rites which signified to the Jews any virtue that they were to practise, ought to be called symbols rather than types; and those rites, if there were any, which were divinely appointed to represent things both present and future, may be regarded as both symbols and types: symbols as denoting things present, and types as indicating things future."

own. One writer of this class, for example, has strongly blamed "divines" for constructing a system of theological types instead of a system of Scripture types, and chronicles his firm assurance that, "had they kept to the Scripture use of the term, instead of devising a theological sense, they would have been saved from much extravagance, and have evolved much more truth."[1] Without retorting with the *argumentum ad hominem*, that the writer in question seems to have overlooked the fact that his own use of the word "type" is equally unscriptural, it is sufficient to reply to such objectors that the word "type" has no precise significance attached to it in Holy Writ; and that therefore, as there is no danger of confusing any precise biblical idea, the theologian has as perfect a right as any other investigator to take this or any other inexact word in common parlance, and by a process of specialization to give it a restricted meaning, if by so doing he can advance the interests of his science: the chemist might as fittingly be censured for adapting the word "salt," or the physicist the word "force," as the theologian for adopting the word "type." Such objectors would do well to ponder the weighty words of a scholarly and exact writer, who says: "The language of Scripture being essentially popular, its use of particular terms naturally partakes of the freedom and variety which are wont to appear in the current speech of a people; and it rarely happens that words are employed, in respect to topics requiring theological treatment, with such precision and uniformity as to enable us, from this source alone, to attain to proper accuracy and fulness. The word 'type' (τύπος) forms no exception to this usage. Occurring once at least in the natural sense of *mark* or *impress* made by a hard substance on one of softer material,[2] it commonly bears the general import of *model, pattern*, or *exemplar*, but with such a wide diversity of application as to comprehend a material object of worship or idol,[3] an external framework constructed for the service of God,[4] the form or copy of an epistle,[5] a method of doctrinal instruction delivered by the first heralds and teachers of the gospel,[6]

[1] M'Cosh, *Typical Forms and Special Ends in Creation*, p. 509.
[2] John xx. 25. [3] Acts vii. 43. [4] Acts vii. 44; Heb. viii. 5.
[5] Acts xxiii. 25. [6] Rom. vi. 17.

a representative character, or, in certain respects, normal example.[1] Such in New Testament Scripture is the diversified use of the word *type* (disguised, however, under other terms in the Authorized Version)." [2] The usage of the word in Scripture being thus unprecise, we are at liberty to employ the word to express what we consider a most important distinction. On the other hand, it has been argued, and the argument has laid hold upon popular religious thought, that the innumerable extravagances and conceits with which the past history of typology has been strewn demonstrate the futility of the study. Typical expositions are denounced in common with the speculations of Talmudists and Rabbis as "playful" and "futile," "approaching the very boundary even of fantastical adaptation;" they are said to be "pious plays of imagination and wit." [3] Now, we do not for a single moment think of defending the luxuriance of Origen, Ambrose, and Hilary, or the more limited indulgence of Augustine in typical interpretation; nor even of defending the scarcely less irrational expositions of Coccejus and his numerous conscious and unconscious followers, who could seriously debate, for example, in what sense Christ was square, like the altar of burnt-offering, — *quadratus quomodo Christus fuerat.* But *abuti non tollit uti;* in fact, the very struggles of successive ages, ridiculous as they may be, to dig in some field of truth, usually testifies to the existence of important ore, whether already struck or not. It is possible to repeat too often the saying of Luther, that "the greater adept a theologian is in imagining typical interpretations, the more learned he is esteemed." The typical teaching of the Oriental Fathers, and the more modern typology of Cock, erred on two grounds,— first, because these investigations lacked a true conception of the mutual relations of the Old and New Testaments; and, secondly, because they were based on no clear definition of a type. Avoiding these errors, let us lose not a jot of the fundamental truth these typologists grasped so firmly.

It was, there need be no hesitation in alleging, a most

[1] Rom. v. 14; 1 Cor. x. 11; Phil. iii. 17; 1 Thess. i. 7; 1 Pet. v. 3.
[2] Fairbairn, *Typology*, vol. i. p. 64.
[3] Compare Kalisch, *Leviticus*, A. §§ 9–11.

valuable and fertile distinction which lay at the basis of the theological instinct concerning types. Having apprehended that the divine revelations to the human race had been made at successive times and by successive stages, the doctrine of types gave utterance to the further apprehension that these revelations were not incongruous and disconnected, but by numerous links, subtle in their location, and by concords prearranged, were inseparably interwoven. To the belief that holy men had spoken things beyond the limits of human thought, the doctrine of types superadded or testified to the addition of the belief that these holy men were moved by one spirit, their utterances having mysterious interconnections with each other, this explaining that, and that completing this. Where the stamp of individuality was visible upon biblical writings and biblical systems, theologians thus expressed their conviction that there was in a similar cast of thought and identical revelations the stamp of a common origin. It is painfully true that theologians have often failed to define in accurate terms this biblical fact which they have vaguely caught sight of, and that they have egregiously blundered when they have proceeded to argue from their prepossession: none the less had they caught a glimpse of a fact, none the less was their prepossession true. As surely as the Scriptures reveal a gradation in their contents and an individuality in their systems, so surely do they reveal in every gradation a fundamental resemblance, and in each individuality an unmistakeable agreement. It is this community of system, this fundamental resemblance under different forms, which the doctrine of types aids us to apprehend. Nor, when once the conception of the historical development of the Scriptures has been seized, is it any longer difficult to fix the precise significance of a type. Type and antitype convey exactly the same truth, but under forms appropriate to different stages of development. "The conception of types is inseparable from that of a theological development in which the present is pregnant with the future."[1] Type and antitype are no casual exponents of a religious truth,—things

[1] Martensen, quoted by Van Oosterzee, *The Theology of the New Testament*, Eng. Trans. p. 33.

which happen by coincidence or chance to embody the same spiritual fact; it is essential to their idea that they should have been divinely prearranged to announce the fact they each in their peculiar way express: "To constitute one thing a type of another, something more is wanting than mere resemblance: the former must not only resemble the latter, but must have been *designed* to resemble the latter; it must have been so designed in its original constitution; it must have been designed as something preparatory to the latter; the type as well as the antitype must have been preordained, and they must have been preordained as constituent parts of the same general scheme of divine providence."[1] Thus it may be said that the purpose a type has to fulfil is rather prospective than present: "The aim . . . of the type is, at a certain stage of the divine revelation, to strengthen the faith for the moment in the Divine Spirit and Word through the exhibition of preparatory witnesses, and at the same time to arouse a susceptibility for the higher stages."[2] A type is thus neither a prophecy nor a symbol nor an allegory, yet it has relations with each of these. A prophecy is a prediction in words, a type a prediction in things. A symbol is a sensuous representation of a thing, a type is such a representation having a distinctly predictive aspect. "A type," to quote the apt words of Rivetus, "is something extracted from the Old Testament, and so extended as to pre-signify and adumbrate something in the New; an allegory is when something out of either Old or New is so expounded and accommodated by some new sense as to conduce to spiritual teaching or practical enforcement."[3] A type is an enacted prophecy, "a kind of prophecy by action,"[4] a non-counterfeit and predictive allegory, a prophetical symbol. A type has three distinct qualities: *it adumbrates something, it adumbrates some future thing, and it is especially designed by God to adumbrate that future thing.* A type, to give as concise a definition as possible, is a sensuous representation of some fact or truth yet to

[1] Marsh, *Lectures on the Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible*, p. 371.
[2] Nitzsch, *System der christlichen Lehre*, § 35.
[3] Quoted by Tholuck, article "Vorbilder," Herzog, vol. xvii. p. 392.
[4] Warburton, *The Divine Legation*, Book IX. chap. ii.

be revealed, or, as Outram puts it, "a symbol of something future."[1]

From what has been said, it follows that types occupy a very different position and fulfil a very different purpose *before* and *after* the appearance of their antitypes. The doctrine of types having for its aim to draw attention to the scriptural fact that God had been pleased to convey the same spiritual truth by different means at different times,—at one time teaching by symbol, and at another without symbolical intervention, — it is an immediate consequence of such a doctrine, that, whilst *before* the advent of the antitype the type should be important according as it heralded approach, *after* such an advent its importance would lie in minute features by which the reality of the truth which both contained should be established. *Before* their fulfilment, types had to create *an attitude of expectancy*, of aspiring content; *after* their fulfilment, they had to convince of *historic continuity*. This important distinction has not been recognised as it should; and hence the aim of those who have betaken themselves to the elucidation of the Scripture types has not been to show how the typical contents of the Old Testament have prepared the way for the contents of the New, but rather to show how the contents of the New Testament have fulfilled the expectations raised by the Old.

An example will make the point before us plain. The Jewish Passover had for its aim not simply to convey certain truths of extreme religious value at the time, but also to make straight the way for that Passover of which the apostle rapturously spoke to the Corinthians. Now *before* the coming of Christ, the Jewish Passover, in its extra-symbolical aspect, was important in the scheme of divine revelation in so far as it enabled the Jew to think, and to think with concentration, upon the time and facts to come,—was important, in short, from the element of prophecy it contained; *after* the death of Christ, the attention becomes fixed on quite other features of the Passover; and, perhaps, as a proof that it was divinely ordained as a figurative exhibition of the sacrifice offered on Calvary, no single element in the ritual is of more moment

[1] Outram, *De Sacrificiis*, Dissert. I. cap. xviii., Eng. Trans. p. 215.

than the command, "A bone shall not be broken."[1] It is the oversight of the very different purpose which the types of Scripture have for the Jew and the Christian, which has given rise to the frequent assertion that a type is incomprehensible without the antitype.[2] Now, it is quite true that "it is Christ who holds the keys of the type, and not Moses,"[3] so long as it is only intended to convey by such a statement that all the inner and preordained resemblances between type and antitype can only be known by a study of the New Testament; it is untrue if it is meant to assert that types had no purpose at all to fulfil before the sealing of the new covenant. If they were "like things opaque in themselves, which waited to shine by the reflection,"[4] their opacity itself emitted a clear and steady light of its own. The tongue of the types was not dumb; denied the musical and various tones of explicit speech, it yet possessed a peculiar eloquent monotone.

Now, with the circumstantial relations between the sacrificial types and their antitypes, we are not at present concerned, inasmuch as the Pentateuch contains no detailed explanation of the significations of its typical contents; all we have to do as yet is to ascertain whether there was not a typical element in all these things, recognisable even in the times to which they were adapted,—whether, in fact, in addition to being symbolical for the times then present, they had not a prophetical element pointing to the times to come. Our present question is, whether there are not grounds from the Pentateuch itself for saying that the Mosaic institutions distinctly represent themselves as preparatory to a dispensation to be revealed.[5] As pagan festivals were commemorations of the past, is there not reason to conclude that the Mosaic

[1] It is the overlooking of this distinction between the aim of types *before* and *after* their fulfilment which has led so many to say with Owen, *Exposition of the Hebrews*, Exercitation v. on the Priesthood of Christ: "The original institution of all expiatory sacrifices . . . was merely to prefigure the sacrifice which Christ was to offer, without which they would have been of no use nor signification," thus ignoring the entire essential and symbolical significance.

[2] Davison, *On Prophecy*, p. 99.

[3] Delitzsch, *Commentar zum Hebräern*, translated in *Foreign Theological Library*, vol. ii. p. 450.

[4] Bushnell, *The Vicarious Sacrifice*, p. 390.

[5] It will be understood that if such a question be answered in the affirmative,

festivals, for example, were, and stated themselves to be, emblematical of future events?[1] Did not Mosaism declare itself to be transitional, and so postpone to a later time the solution of the difficulties inseparable from the manner in which its revelations were conveyed?

In reply to the assertion, that "of the prophetic meaning of the types no hint is given in the Law,"[2] the counter assertion may be made that many such hints are given. One argument for the transitional nature of Mosaism, which even the contemporary of Moses might employ, may be found in the fact that the Mosaic dispensation was no sufficient fulfilment of the promise made to Abraham and his sons. "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed," were the words of Jehovah to Abraham; but so far from Mosaism being a universal advantage, it was so exclusive that the stranger at the gate could enjoy but few of the blessings of its worship; and with its central Tabernacle and expensive ceremonial, it was an impossibility even for the Jew, when once the wilderness life was at an end, to avail himself, in the pressure of his daily avocation and social duties, except at the festal celebrations, of sacrificial forgiveness and sanctification. If Jehovah was veracious, the fulfilment of the promise had not yet come.

A similar argument may be adduced from the terms of the Sinaitic covenant, which is not without cogency to prove the point at issue. A divine announcement had been made to the entire congregation, "Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation;" and what was the fulfilment which the law of Moses presented? So far from being "a kingdom of priests," the priesthood belonged to a privileged class, selected

the edge of one large class of objections urged against the typical nature of Old Testament revelation is completely turned. Kalisch, for example, is altogether beside the mark when he so caustically writes: "*Were* (the sacrifices) understood as types? *Could* they possibly be recognised as such? If the former alternative be supposed, all individual Israelites were prophetically inspired; if the latter, the typical relation must so clearly, so organically and inherently lie in the sacrificial laws, that it occurs spontaneously to the mind. But the one assumption is a paradox . . . the other a palpable fallacy."—*Leviticus*, Essay A. ix. 11.

[1] Faber, *Horæ Mosaicæ*, vol. ii. p. 235.

[2] Litton, *The Mosaic Dispensation*, p. 79.

from a small section of the nation; and so far from being "a holy nation," every feature of their imposing ritual had been exquisitely constructed to excite a sense of sinfulness. As the pious Jew entered within the gates of the Court and saw the priests, barefoot and clad in white, entering the Holy Place, thoughts must be aroused, in remembrance of the divine promise, of a time when, atonement and distance being no longer necessary in the Court, he might be permitted to enter the Holy Place and present his offerings of prayer and light and labour; but as yet in the Tabernacle of God no such priestly function was his. Either Jehovah was not veracious, or His covenant was not yet fulfilled.

Then, leaving these more general considerations, advance may be made to the argument in favour of the preparatory purpose of the Levitical institutions, and especially of the Levitical sacrifices, to be drawn from an examination of the whole paraphernalia of worship. Must it not have struck any thoughtful worshipper that there was a tremendous contrast between what the several portions of the cultus were, and what they were supposed to be? Ideally perfect, what must have been his thought concerning the insufficiency, the degradation, the materialism of the reality? Were all these things superstitions, valuable for the education of the masses, but hindrances to a warmer and more rational spirit? Were they instances of a divine toleration of idolatrous practices for the attainment of some ultimate good? To offer the former solution of the difficulty, would have been to ignore the divine origin of these institutions; to offer the latter would have been to hold a creed utterly consistent with the revelation of the nature of Jehovah contained in the first and second commandments of the decalogue. What, then, was the meaning of these forms and ceremonies made according to the divine pattern in the Mount? Must not these material things, symbols as they were of spiritual things, have had it for their aim, it might be rationally argued, to suggest a time when both form and substance should be adequately united? The formal insufficiency of the Mosaic rites meets us at every side of our subject. It is seen clearly enough in the Tabernacle and its furniture. The Tabernacle was said to be the dwelling

of Jehovah ;—it was a moveable structure of precious metal and wood and skins, which could be a dwelling-place for the Most High only by the lowliest condescension. Who, it may be confidently asked, that had entered into the significance of the revelation of the divine nature made at the Burning Bush,[1] could regard without amazement Bezaleel's edifice, and know that there Jehovah dwelt ? Silver and gold and fine linen and tapestry and cherubim might be eloquent symbols of the glory of a divine residence, but who that had assimilated the precious lessons of the descendants of Abraham, could find in these things a fitting and eternal abode for Abraham's God ? And what was the nature of this divine residence with man ? Was it such as the promises might have aroused an expectation of enjoying ? It was not a visible revelation of the divine glory ; it was not even such a revelation as Moses received when he was placed in a cleft of rock, God shading his eyes, whilst His glory swept by : the Holy of Holies was but the throne-room as of some Eastern potentate, who, himself remaining invisible, transacted all the affairs of state by his viziers,—nay, in this case, the viziers themselves knew no more of the ruling majesty than was visible in the shroud of cloud. Perhaps nothing showed more clearly the manifest accommodation in all these sacred things than the fact that, before their recognition as divine accessories, they needed consecration. The formal inadequacy of the priesthood was just as conspicuous. The priests had been appointed because of their especial holiness and fitness to act as mediators between God and the Jew. And what were these boasted moral qualifications ? A something imputed by the mercy of God and invisible in actual life. If a book were written of " The Lives of the Priests," it would contain a few cases of eminent piety and chastened public spirit, many of ecclesiastical arrogance, wilful disobedience, and rebellious irreligion, and the majority of a bigoted conservatism and a literal interpretation of the priestly functions which bordered on idolatry. Nor were they better qualified as mediators ; for, partakers though they manifestly were of the humanity and sin of their fellow-countrymen, there was nothing either in their origin or their

[1] Ex. iii. 6.

history which gave them the slightest right to represent to humanity the God of their salvation: so far from being divine, they were grossly human; and so far from being representative of the best of their nation, they were often foremost in circumventing and persecuting the noblest and most prominently spiritually-minded. Again, when we come to the ritual of sacrifice, words can scarcely express the disproportion between the symbols and the things symbolized. Without entering into the numerous details which have already been sufficiently repeated, and simply regarding the main feature of sacrificial worship, that of atonement, how can the process of accommodation be described which was evidently pursued therein, when a domestic creature of pure parts, without having any voice in the matter of its own, endures the penalty denounced upon human guilt, and becomes an acceptable and holy substitute? Or what can be said when, in cases of extreme poverty, the sin of the offerer was expunged by a handful of meal, without the presentation of an animal substitute? The argument, then, is this: Seeing the disproportion between the Mosaic sacrificial symbols and the things symbolized, such symbols could have had no recognition, certainly no authorization, at the hands of the Jehovah of the Jews, as even the Jew himself would recognise, unless, in addition to their spiritual suggestiveness, they had been intended, in connection with the promises made to the chosen people, to arouse an expectancy of a time when the contrast between ideal and real, form and substance, should be no more. Symbols were employed by God as a method of teaching important truths *by illustration* as it were, by *scenic representation*, although those symbols were inadequate embodiments of those truths and might possibly mislead; but those symbols, from their very insufficiency, had an element of prophecy which pointed to a future time, when, the day of figurative representation having passed, those same truths should be painted upon the eye of man by forms adequate and expression proportionate.

Again, the argument for the typical import of Mosaism may be strengthened by the fact of the frequent, nay, the common, impossibility of compliance with the legal precepts.

Every Israelite was bound by the law; but it was impracticable for every Israelite to keep the law. Having regard to the single command that every sacrifice should be offered in one place, at the altar of burnt-offering, was it not impossible that an inhabitant of Dan or Beersheba, or even of a more central town, to say nothing of every dweller in the camp or on the mountains in the days of the wanderings, should repair, each time he became conscious of some sin of ignorance or indiscretion, to offer his sin-offering at the Tabernacle? Could every mother after childbirth, every leper upon cure, every man during impurity, cleanse himself in the appointed way? Was it even possible that the duties of agriculture, trade, or citizenship could be abandoned three times a year, as the Law appointed as its lightest grade of performance, or even once a year, as custom interpreted the Law, whilst every male presented himself at the feasts? Why, then, were these rigorous prescriptions made only to be broken? To render conscious of sin is an insufficient reply. It is also insufficient to say that they were enjoined in order that all might take to heart the truths which those symbolic representations enshrined. It is true that, if all could not offer these sacrifices of atonement or sanctification, the truths were for all, that atonement by the spilling of the life of a substitute was within reach, and that the privilege of all was a sanctification unto God; but the question remains, "Why were these truths sensuously taught? why, when the truths themselves were commonly received, were the sensuous representations still ordained?" The argument to be found in the impracticability of obedience to the legal prescriptions in behalf of the typical nature of Mosaism, again recurs;—these truths were sensuously taught, these sensuous representations were incessantly enjoined, in order that the national outlook might be directed by the comparatively unfulfilled promises of God to a time yet to come, when types and shadows would end in antitypes and realities.

Thus, granting the premises, which the Books of Moses themselves demand, that the covenants made with Abraham and his descendants were actually arranged and concluded by that Jehovah, the "I AM" of Whose revelation gave proof at

once of His power and deliberateness in doing what He would, we must conclude that the insufficient fulfilment given in Mosaism to the promise to Abraham and to the Israelites at Sinai, coupled with the contrasts tolerated by the Law between the sacred symbols and the things symbolized, and between the Law and its practice, would irresistibly point the mind of the inquirer to some subsequent fulfilment for which these things of sense were preparing the way. If the letter of the divine word was to stand, if the products of the divine mind were not to be convicted of unworthiness, ceremonial and symbol must be but shadows of realities yet to come. The Law itself must have suggested to any thoughtful mind that, if the word of God stood sure, the Tabernacle and its rites would one day pass away like stars at the rising of the sun. It will be seen in our next part how this conviction was taken up and deepened by the strains of prophecy.

It might have been added, that the words of the Law also afford illustration to the reasoning of Pascal, with which this chapter has been headed, that the Mosaic ritual could not have been intended to last for ever, inasmuch as it is described as at once pleasing and displeasing God; but we do not dwell upon this, because we must presently insist upon this feature of Old Testament testimony.

In conclusion, the words of a well-known and eloquent writer may be repeated: "You deny, or in confessing you neutralize, any typical import, any prospective atonement. Mark, then, the mysteries that emerge on your supposition. The whole spiritual system of the Hebrew Scriptures is made up of two elements, entwined with the most intricate closeness, yet absolutely opposite in character. You are, then, to answer how it was that every particular of a long and laborious system of minute and often very repulsive sacrificial observances is found united in the same volume with conceptions of God that surpass, in their profound and internal spirituality, all that unassisted man has ever elsewhere imagined,—nay, all that our modern refinement is able to emulate. What miraculous mind was it that combined these singular contradictions? Where is there a *real* parallel to this mysterious inconsistency? Who is this strange Instructor, or series of

instructors, that now portrays the form of an everlasting essence, hid in the veil of attributes that are themselves unfathomable, and now issues minute and elaborate directions as to the proper mode and the tremendous obligation of slaughtering a yearling lamb; and this as the duty of him who would approach the Eternal Spirit? Who is He that at one moment enounces the simplest, sublimest code of human duties in existence; at another, — nay, in the same page, the same sentence,—exhorts with equal earnestness to the equal necessity of drenching the earth with animal blood as the appointed path of human purification? Here, then, in the texture of the Old Testament and its polity, is a mystery greater than any you can escape by denying its predictive import. It is altogether impossible on any supposition but the one, the supposition which alone can elevate ceremonies to the dignity of moral obligations. Judaism with a typical atonement may be a miracle or a chain of miracles; but Judaism without it is a greater miracle still."[1]

[1] Archer Butler, *Sermons*, p. 192.

CHAPTER VI.

GENERAL REVIEW OF THE MOSAIC SACRIFICIAL INJUNCTIONS.

"The main source of knowledge in regard to Mosaism is the Canonical Scripture of the Old Testament: its basis is a special revelation; its character, monotheistic; its form, theocratic; its worship, symbolico-typical; its design, purely moral; its standpoint, that of external authority, but, at the same time, of conscious preparation for a higher development."—VAN OOSTERZEE, *The Theology of the New Testament*, Eng. Trans. p. 28.

WE have now completed our examination of the Mosaic doctrine of Sacrifice, so far as it was exhibited at its first institution, and in its early practice; and although we have not exceeded the five books of the Law,—that is to say, have confined ourselves to the study of the sacrificial worship of the Israelites during the forty years of wandering in the wilderness of Sinai,—the results obtained have not been unimportant. A summary of these results it will be convenient to present in their bearing upon the wider doctrine of scriptural Sacrifice.

When the children of Israel had, by the divine might and guidance, made their way to the Sinaitic desert, a revelation was given to them on the summit of the Mount whence Jehovah spake from His garment of flaming cloud, and arrangements were commenced for the concluding of a solemn covenant. "If ye will obey my voice indeed," was the one provision of the covenant; the other provision was: "Ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation."[1] The elements of obedience thus made the condition of blessing were then imparted after a three days' national fast, and consisted, in the first place, of the decalogue, and afterwards, in greater detail, of the general features of the civil, social,

[1] Ex. xix. 5, 6.

and religious aspects of the Mosaic constitution. After the sealing of the covenant by a national sacrificial service, and the idolatrous defection during the absence of Moses upon the Mount, the religious features of the covenant were still further expanded, and the details were imparted of the one sanctuary henceforth to be the distinctive element of the Old Testament dispensation, and of the Aaronic priesthood; these religious commands being subsequently supplemented by the laws concerning the sacrifices, the consecration and duties of the priesthood, the various purifications and the festal seasons, promulgated from the shechinah above the ark of the covenant. Thus the chosen nation was singled out from the nations of the earth not alone by the divine favour which brought them forth from bondage, but by the impartation of a minutely revealed system of worship. The Cretans might boast of Minos, the Spartans of Lycurgus, the Locrians of Zaleucus; the lawgiver of the Israelites was pre-eminent amongst them all, since the code which he proclaimed was no product of human intelligence or juristic skill, but an express divine revelation. Thenceforth the patriarchal system of worship, equally applicable to any servant of the Most High, whether Israelite or non-Israelite, was to give place amongst the descendants of Abraham to a compact, exclusive, national, and divinely ordained cultus.

The religious worship divinely instituted in the desert, undoubtedly fulfilled several minor purposes. It tended to divert the attention from the sensuous attractions of the idolatry with which the people had been associated in Egypt;[1] it had a considerable influence in preserving the sense of national unity;[2] it constituted an invaluable code of sanitary regulations;[3] it even fostered the preservation of genealogies;[4]

[1] It was this feature which, with all his rationalistic tendencies, it was the honour of Spencer to have contributed and illustrated once for all in the study of Mosaism (see Part iii. cap. iv.).

[2] One of the most politic acts of Jeroboam for securing the rupture of the tribes was the institution of a rival sanctuary at Bethel.

[3] The sanitary and police precautions of the Mosaic law have suggested the favourite point of view of Mosaism of some rationalistic writers (see Hess, *Geschichte Mose's*, p. 374; Michaelis, *Mosaisches Recht*, vol. iv. § 207; Saalschütz, *Mosaisches Recht*, p. 21).

[4] Lowman, *Rational of the Hebrew Ritual*, p. 190.

but none of these was its primary aim. To offer a bull in sacrifice, unquestionably prevented the offering of sacrifice to the bull itself, as in Egypt; the laws of purification prevented the heedless disregard of the conditions of health so common in large communities; and the restriction of all sacrificial worship to one place must have fostered a splendid *esprit de corps:* the singularity of the Mosaic law was, that none of these things were directly aimed at,—they were secondary effects of causes, the primary purpose of which was the culture of the religious life. "Seek first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness; and all these things" (civil and social) "shall be added unto you," might have been taken as the motto of Judaism: Church and State were so united in Judaism, that the very purposes of government were best furthered by attention to the duties of religion.[1] What the religious import of the Mosaic cultus was has already been seen.

It pleased Jehovah to command the consecration of a carefully devised Tabernacle as a place of worship, and of a rigorously selected class from the tribe of Levi to officiate in that sanctuary. It also pleased Him to convey commands for a detailed system of worship, consisting of a sacrificial ritual of varied forms, accurately adapted to the expression of individual and national needs, and so diversified as to reflect, as the year ran its course, the various emotions aroused in the heart by the remembrance of the goodness of God in creating, preserving, redeeming, and sanctifying the people He had selected as His own. Of the details of the ordained place of sacrifice, of the sacrificial ministrants, of the bodily and spiritual preparations for sacrifice, or of the sacrificial times and seasons, treated at a tedious, if insufficient, length in the preceding chapters, nothing more needs be said.

A single glance at this elaborate religious constitution assures that it was a ritual of the symbolic class. Whatever truth it

[1] Compare Lowth, *Lectures on Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews*, vol. i. lect. 8: "The religion of the Hebrews embraced a very extensive circle of divine and human economy. It not only included all that regarded the worship of God; it extended even to the regulation of the commonwealth, the ratification of the laws, the forms and administration of justice, and almost all the relations of civil and domestic life. With them almost every point of conduct was connected either directly or indirectly with religion."

had to convey was conveyed under material forms: the eye was made the gateway to the spirit; the nerves of sense were made to thrill, that some faint wave at least might touch the soul; adjuncts of gold and colour were employed to speak of God; gorgeous vestments and precious stones proclaimed the sanctity of a priesthood; washing with water betokened the cleansing of the heart; the fire that consumed the sacrifice told its tale of divine acceptance. Religious worship was ritualistic.

This symbolism, so mysteriously selected and permitted for spiritual ends (as those are apt to think who have been trained under a faith which takes as its cardinal principle that God is a Spirit), fulfilled a double purpose. It taught religious truths which verily constituted a divine revelation, and at the same time prepared the way for a further revelation, in which the same truths could be conveyed in a clearer, more convincing, and more direct manner. Its symbolism was at once a symbolism proper and a typology.

The Mosaic cultus was evidently adapted, in the first place, to disclose a knowledge of certain great religious truths of the highest importance in eliciting and developing a truly spiritual life. Gathering together the hints scattered here and there throughout the ritual injunctions, and using them as a guide in the study of the infinitely suggestive symbolism of the ritual itself, we were enabled to ascertain with tolerable distinctness what elements of religious knowledge and feeling this new edition of the old covenant gave to the Jew indeed. What these truths were in the main, has been stated in the second and third chapters of this part. We will not repeat the conclusions arrived at, but content ourselves with saying that ample provision was made to convince of the love and justice of God, the nature and heinousness of sin, the forgiveness of sins, and the satisfaction for those cravings after closer communion, and those spontaneous outbursts of self-surrender, which characterize a right state of mind towards our Creator and Redeemer.

At the same time that the Mosaic worship acted as a discipline for the sinful spirit of man, and imparted to him the facts of divine pardon and sanctifying power, the very form

in which these things were conveyed, combined with the views imparted concerning the veracity and spirituality of God, drew on the attention almost imperceptibly to the belief in the preparatory nature of these religious aids. The Jew who studied the Law must have learnt much about the nature and purposes of Jehovah, but also much of the transitional and temporary nature of his own faith. A more successful system of religious education has never been seen. It satisfied, expanded, and corrected the spiritual cravings of its worshippers; it also prepared the way for the more spiritual and reasonable worship of the future. Its work was to arouse longings, some of which it could, and some could never, allay.

As a consequence of the symbolic and typical aspects of the Mosaic sacrifices, it followed that these prescribed rites were sacramental. They became channels of blessings they were powerless in themselves to produce. Types and shadows, by the mercy of God, wrought the wonders of antitype and realities.

But, if sacramental, these rites made many a call upon the spiritual nature of the worshipper. The Levitical sacraments were not *opera operata*. To every objective act there was a subjective side of accompanying feeling. Nor was it enough to obey as well as sacrifice; obedience was to be with the whole heart. So far from being purely mechanical and a gross routine, as some describe, Judaism demanded wide-reaching qualifications of deep feeling in all acceptable service.

Thus in a language as of nature or poesy, and at the same time of prophecy, were presented to the Jewish mind some of the deepest truths which the human heart can receive; and it is not wonderful that many intelligent observers should approve of this Sinaitic faith. To say with Milman, "The fundamental principle of the Jewish constitution, the purity of worship, was guarded by penal statutes, and by a religious ceremonial admirably adapted to the age and genius of the people,"[1] is but cold and hesitant commendation. Even to say that, "surveying the Levitical system of sacrifice, we are bound to admit that, as a whole, it is judicious and thoughtful, simple yet comprehensive, clearly and plainly symbolical,

[1] Milman, *History of the Jews*, 4th ed. vol. i. p. 150.

broad and intelligible in its principles, coherent and consistent, and skilfully adapted both to the requirements of individuals and of a theocratic community,"[1] is insufficient. "Whoever shall consider the laws of Moses and rites of the Hebrew worship, as enacted by the authority of Jehovah and given for the use of the seed of Abraham, will easily conclude they are such rules of religion and constitution of worship as are fit for the wisdom and goodness of God to choose and appoint for the use of a favoured people, called to be a holy nation to Himself, who were to serve and to worship Him in a manner more honourable than the other nations of the earth; in such manner as should promote the perfection and happiness of their own minds in every part of true religion, or in all sobriety, righteousness, and goodness, piety and godliness,—that is, in every virtue human, social, and divine."[2] The Psalms of David are the best panegyric of Mosaism; the Lamentations of Jeremiah, its noblest elegy.

But we must not overlook the necessity of a comparison of the religion of Moses with that of the Patriarchs, in order to ascertain the advance that has been made in the Old Testament doctrine of Sacrifice. The problem to be solved by any doctrine of Sacrifice was, so to counteract the influence of human transgression as to as nearly as possible restore that fearless and trustful relationship of man to God, in which he could give his whole self—body, soul, and spirit—to the divine service. The patriarchal faith gave (as we saw in the first part of this book) but a very partial solution. Divine permission was granted for sacrificial worship on the fulfilment of certain objective and subjective conditions; but notwithstanding that the subjective conditions were a sense of penitence and self-surrender, the one objective condition was but the presentation of animal sacrifice, the ritual of which was little developed, and the inner significance so slightly apprehended as to give no intellectual rest beyond a trust in God. Now, the Mosaic doctrine of Sacrifice gave no more encouragement than the Patriarchal to an approach to God

[1] Kalisch, *Leviticus*, A. § 20.

[2] Lowman, *Rational of Hebrew Ritual*, p. 23.

in entire self-surrender without the intervention of animal sacrifice: the sacrifices it enjoined were still symbolic; nevertheless, it showed a considerable advance both upon the objective and subjective sides, and bore upon its surface distincter marks of the purpose of its institution. If the patriarchal worship was divinely suggested, the Mosaic was divinely commanded; hence divinely arranged adaptations for special ends supplant the tentative additions which characterize a human development, and, at the same time, those special ends themselves become a subject for express revelation. The various details in which the Sinaitic doctrine excelled its predecessor, will at once occur to the reader. If we regard the ritual employed in the presentation of sacrifice, the difference between the two dispensations is most striking. We seem to have passed from childhood, when the highest constructive efforts result in houses of cards or structures of sand which a touch of the hand or the rising tide will disintegrate, to the gigantic architectural efforts which the wear of time or sudden convulsions can alone destroy. There is a magnificent sanctuary where any heap of stones formerly served: a richly endowed and carefully trained priesthood, where the father of a family formerly did duty for his own, a prince for his people, or any man for himself; a ritual of a thousand precepts to excite and express the devotion, for which a few precedents and any improvised ritual formerly sufficed. The gain was manifest. The religious nature may be approached by many channels, and delights in a diversified service; and, provided sufficient attention is paid that ceremonial delivers up its spiritual significance, religious ceremonies may, in a certain state of culture, be a useful means to a valuable end. This was most certainly the case in the Mosaic dispensation; for carefully adjusted precautions were taken to ensure the religious effect of the ceremonial by appropriate teaching. In this interpretation also of its symbolism, Mosaism was a considerable advance upon the worship of the Patriarchal Age. Whilst Abraham and his sons had to rest in their sacrificial rites upon a sense of the divine approval, their descendants, in presenting their more elaborate sacrifices, were permitted to comprehend some of the reasons

of that divine approval. Sacrifices which, under the Patriarchs, were but symbolical of the mental state of the worshipper,—or if symbolical of aught else, so imaginatively that there was only room for hope and conjecture where the soul yearned for assurance and knowledge,—have become, under the later revelation, emblems not alone of spiritual feelings, but of objective grounds for those feelings. We never read of "atonement" in patriarchal times. The fact was there, but the assurance of it rested simply upon a conviction of the divine mercy: when remission of sins was assured to the righteous offering of animal blood, there was a great gain to the sinful soul in clearness of view, and therefore in intellectual content. All was not solved, but much was. Then the Mosaic doctrine of Sacrifice, by its insufficiency if by no other means, pointed onwards to a more complete and satisfying faith in the future; and here also there was a religious benefit to the heedful. From its more detailed ritual, from the greater demands which that ritual made upon the spiritual nature of the worshipper, from the truths which that ritual more clearly inculcated concerning the nature and purposes of Jehovah, materialistic and temporizing as the Mosaic ritual was, it was nevertheless most exquisitely adapted to the religious education of the Jewish race, and a great step taken towards "pure and undefiled religion."

But Moses was before his time, or, as we should rather say, the religion entrusted to him to establish was too mature for the stiff-necked people he was leading; and it was only after a lengthy discipline of pain and precept that they appreciated and assimilated this divine gift to the nation. Before we can estimate the influence exercised by the Mosaic doctrine of Sacrifice upon the Jewish race, we must know the process of its assimilation, and be made aware of the methods pursued to bring home those essential features only too liable to be overlooked. This process of the assimilation and development of the Mosaic doctrine of Sacrifice, as far as it can be deduced from the Scriptures, will form the subject of the next part of this book.

PART III.

THE POST-MOSAIC DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE.

"Qui jugera de la religion des Juifs par les grossiers, la connoîtra mal. Elle est visible dans les saints livres, et dans la tradition des prophètes."—PASCAL, *Pensées*, "Des Juifs," xi.

CHAPTER I.

THE NATIONAL CONCEPTION OF MOSAIC SACRIFICE.

"Ad curandi rationem nihil plus confert quam experientia."—CORNELIUS CELSUS, *De Medicinâ, præfatio.*

THUS far we have been occupied in our study of the post-patriarchal times with the description and significance of the Mosaic injunctions, and have seen, what a strict examination undoubtedly shows them to contain, an immediate satisfaction for the religious wants of the Jewish people, and, at the same time, a system of elementary religious education,—a painful alphabet,—to be taught and reiterated until the nation could read the divine purpose without blundering. These injunctions of the Levitical rubric remained in force from the days when they were made till the period of the Old Testament closed. Whole pages might be filled with the catalogue of minute features of the Law which are incessantly appearing throughout the subsequent historical, poetical, and prophetical books, whilst undesigned coincidences innumerable continually suggest the conviction that the ceremonial law, as revealed to Moses, was the source and stimulus of all the genuine spiritual life of the people.

A scarcely less important epoch now opens before us,—the times of assimilation and development of the Sinaitic revelation. Divine light had entered the mind of Moses like lightning; but what Moses saw at a glance, the nation could only perceive like a dawn stealing to meridian. The seed given at Sinai must grapple with climate and soil, and we have to trace its history till it gives lodgment to a people. Or, again changing the figure, if the sacrifice of Abel be likened

to the birth of a larva, the Patriarchal Age to its days of grovelling life, the residence in Egypt to its chrysalis stage, and Sinai to the bursting of the moth, then, developing the illustration, it may be said that we have now to trace the flutterings of the imago amidst acanthus and rose, by night and by day, in poverty and in plenty, until it too droops, and, as in the ancient fable, a more ethereal growth starts from its corpse.

The period of assimilation and development of the Mosaic conceptions of sacrifice, which extends from the giving of the Law on Sinai to the coming of Christ, is characterized by three distinct movements, each of which will demand a separate chapter,—namely, the assimilation effected by the national history, the assimilation effected by the example and writings of men of extraordinary piety, and the assimilation and development effected by the prophets. In this chapter we have to see the process of assimilation during the stages of the national history.

It is the peculiarity of the historical books of the Old Testament that they are not complete catalogues of the historical facts of the period of which they treat, nor even complete descriptions of sections of human history, but compilations made from these wider fields according to distinct principles. We shall be understood if we adopt a modern distinction, and say that the Old Testament histories do not contain history *as such, but a selection of historical facts made in accordance with a determinate philosophy of history.* It was the privilege of the chosen people to be conscious from the first of the purport of their national vicissitudes, and, instead of placing faith in the erratic wheel of Fortuna, or in the Fates "which rule both gods and men," to believe in a Providence who not only held all the threads which made up the pattern of their life, but who had also revealed to them the general features of that pattern. The words of the original covenant, made amidst flame and trumpet and lightning, had been frequently reiterated; and they knew that *national misfortune* indicated *national wrong-doing*, and *national prosperity* a *national obedience to the divine commands.* "If ye will obey my voice indeed, . . . ye shall be a peculiar trea-

sure,"[1] were the words of the primary compact; "Behold, I make a covenant: before all thy people I will do marvels; . . . observe thou that which I command thee,"[2] were the words in which, after the fracture of the golden calf, the covenant was renewed; and, as the boundary of the Jordan was crossed, to the same effect came the divine proclamation: "Behold, I set before you this day a blessing and a curse; a blessing, if ye will obey the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you this day: and a curse, if ye will not obey the commandments of the Lord your God, but turn aside out of the way."[3] To Joshua also the Almighty had said, at the outset of his career: "Only be thou strong and very courageous, that thou mayest observe to do according to all the law, which Moses My servant commanded thee: turn not from it to the right hand or to the left, that thou mayest prosper whithersoever thou goest. This book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth; . . . for then thou shalt make thy way prosperous, and then thou shalt have good success."[4] Thus pain became indissolubly associated in the Hebrew mind with error, and pleasure with righteousness. Thus the national history became, by its annals of intermittent adversity and success, both a powerful stimulus to the legal performance of sacrifice, and a strong deterrent from its illegal performance. The national experience was a most potent agent in the instruction of the Jews in the necessity, nature, and value of the Mosaic worship.[5]

No sooner had the primary Sinaitic covenant been sealed by the solemn act of public sacrifice, and divinely ratified by the vision of glory[6] vouchsafed to the elders, than the trial of faith commenced, which ever follows in Scripture, as in life, a time

[1] Ex. xix. 5. [2] Ex. xxxiv. 10, 11.

[3] Deut. xi. 26–28. [4] Josh. i. 7, 8.

[5] Let it be noted that there is authority in the Hebrew arrangement of the canon for the distinction above drawn between ordinary history and history so written as to convey and illustrate certain religious truths; for some of the historical books are classed among the prophetical books because of their didactic element, whilst others form a section of the more purely literary productions of the Hagiographa. It is with the contents of the former—viz., the Books of Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, and 1 and 2 Kings—that this chapter is more immediately concerned.

[6] Ex. xxiv. 9–11.

of exceptional revelation. During the absence of Moses upon the Mount, Aaron cast a golden calf, in imitation of the Egyptian conception of the bull as representative of the power of nature, before which an altar was built and sacrifices made; the divine anger was aroused, and slaughter and plague[1] burnt into the heart of the nation the sin of idolatrous sacrificing. That experience was supplemented by the consequences which attended the lapse into idolatry at Moab, when twenty-four thousand fell by the hand of the Lord.[2] In the Korahitic rebellion[3] against the ordained priesthood, the importance of another prominent feature in Mosaic sacrifice was stamped by the awful issue, as with a searing iron, upon the popular consciousness.

In the glorious days of the leadership of Joshua, the fruits of obedience to the Sinaitic injunctions so richly reaped became a most luminous precedent. His was evidently "prosperity and good success," as the Lord had said, because he was "strong and very courageous to observe and do according to all the law which Moses commanded." Immediately upon Joshua's assumption of leadership, the miraculous parting of the Jordan before the ark of the covenant[4] spoke of the divine approval of the respect paid to the Mosaic appointments; and this mark of favour was speedily followed by the fall of the walls of Jericho,[5] in which the priests and Levites took so prominent a part. In after-times the days of Joshua were remembered as an age when Jehovah signally honoured His people for obedience to His laws, and the Tabernacle at Shiloh[6] was regarded as the centre of an ardent religious life and an abundant prosperity.

In the time of the Judges—"the heroic age of Hebrew history"[7]—the attractions of legal and idolatrous sacrificing divide the national attention. The inevitable consequences follow. A considerable portion of the extant history of that time is occupied with the narrative of the punishments which, in the course of divine providence, followed dereliction of religious duty, or of the removal of those punishments which

[1] Ex. xxxii. 25–35. [2] Num. xxv. [3] Num. xvi.
[4] Josh. iii. 10–17, iv. 10–14. [5] Josh. vi. [6] Josh. xviii. 1–10.
[7] Milman, *History of the Jews*, 4th ed. vol. i. p. 238.

was immediately consequent upon a return to the path of Mosaic rectitude. The pictures of the age which remain resemble a series of dissolving views, which, retaining the same background of the Tabernacle and priesthood as the centre of the theocratic life, now present in the centre of sight a people mechanically religious, with tendencies towards heathenism, who are being severely scourged by some hostile inroad, and now a people enjoying the very sweetness of the divine favour as they obediently follow the leadership of some hero whose originality of address is only paralleled by his religious conservatism. The whole period is a series of alternations. On the one hand, religious feeling such as was displayed in the song of Deborah,[1] the career of Gideon,[2] the Nazarite vow of Samson,[3] and the prayer of Hannah, receives visible proof of the divine approbation in national or individual prosperity; on the other hand, such absence of true religious feeling as resulted in the worship of Baal and the Ashtaroth,[4] the vow of Jephthah,[5] the rival sanctuary at Dan,[6] and the sacrilege of the sons of Eli,[7] was visited by severe marks of the divine displeasure. "And the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord, and served Baalim: And they forsook the Lord God of their fathers. . . . And the anger of the Lord was hot against Israel, and He delivered them into the hands of spoilers. . . . Whithersoever they went out, the hand of the Lord was against them for evil, as the Lord had said, and as the Lord had sworn against them.—Nevertheless the Lord raised up judges. . . . And when the Lord raised them up judges, then the Lord was with the judge, and delivered them out of the hand of their enemies all the days of the judge. . . . And it came to pass, when the judge was dead, that they returned and corrupted themselves more than their fathers." [8]

The same divine displeasure fell upon Saul. In his case the necessity of strict obedience to the Law was most terribly inculcated; for having, in the absence of a priest, personally offered a burnt sacrifice to the Lord, the stern sentence immediately followed: "Thou hast done foolishly: thou hast not

[1] Judg. v. [2] Judg. vi.–viii. [3] Judg. xvi. 7. [4] Judg. ii. 11–23.
[5] Judg. xi. [6] Judg. xvii.–xxi. [7] 1 Sam. ii.–iv. [8] Judg. ii. 11–19.

kept the commandment of the Lord thy God which He commanded thee: for now would the Lord have established thy kingdom upon Israel for ever. But now thy kingdom shall not continue."[1] By his ritual irregularity his sins had reached a crisis, and the sceptre had passed from his descendants.

The days of the undivided monarchy under David and Solomon were the palmiest days of the Hebrew history. In David the nation had been granted another Joshua, who, by the divine blessing upon his sanctified generalship and lowly royalty, carried to completion that labour of conquest and statesmanship commenced at the first division of the land. For our purpose it is only necessary to note that these glorious days of King David, which afterwards became the national ideal of a polity, were days of the most faithful adhesion to the Mosaic forms of worship. No Jew could thoughtfully ponder upon those prosperous days, and not remember that the son of Jesse inaugurated his reign by burning the Philistine images at Baal-perizim,[2] sanctified his capture of the stronghold of Zion by making it the central sanctuary,[3] brought the ark to its resting-place with songs, sacrifices, and dances,[4] coveted beyond conquest the honour of transforming the Tent into the Temple of witness,[5] completed the organization of the priestly service which Samuel had begun,[6] elevated the leading priests to a seat at his council,[7] mingled his tears at leaving his beloved sanctuary with those which were wrung from him by the rebellion of Absalom,[8] and laid his genius and experience under contribution to provide psalms, which, as we shall see in the next chapter, perpetually testified to his joyful recognition of the spiritual advantages of the tabernacle service. Nor was the reign of Solomon wanting in testimony to the pre-established harmony between prosperity and fidelity to Mosaism. The most ready association with the brilliant reign of the typal Prince of Peace, when Judah and Israel "dwelt safely," was the building of the Temple,[9] at the con-

[1] 1 Sam. xiii. 9–14. [2] 2 Sam. v. 21. [3] 2 Sam. v. 7, vi. 16.
[4] 2 Sam. vi. 12–18. [5] 2 Sam. vii. [6] 1 Chron. xxiii.–xxvi.
[7] 2 Sam. viii. 16–18. [8] 2 Sam. xv. 24–30.
[9] It is unnecessary to enter into a detailed description of the Temple of Solomon, since the Temple was but an enlarged and immoveable Tabernacle.

secration of which the thousands of peace-offerings[1] brought the sense of divine fellowship into thousands of hearts and homes. A cloud, however, gathered across the horizon at the close of Solomon's life, and, for his sacrifices to strange gods, the rule was snatched from his posterity.[2] "For more than three hundred years the evil seed scattered by Solomon bore evil fruit."

In the time of the divided empire, we seem to have alighted upon a second epoch of the Judges. The whole period is again a series of alternations of light and gloom, according as the Mosaic institutions were remembered or forgotten. The punishments denounced upon the descendants of Solomon were not long delayed. Civil and foreign wars, social and spiritual degeneracy, an open practice of the flagrant idolatries of the surrounding nations, were the common features of the times, these painful annals being occasionally interspersed with the holy endeavours of God-fearing kings, or the wide-spread revivals initiated by prophetic appeal.

It was the kingdom of Israel in which the consequences of relinquishing the old paths were depicted in most startling characters. Jeroboam had commenced his reign with the erection, apparently from political motives, of two golden calves,[3]—the one at Dan, the northern limit of the kingdom; and the other at Bethel, the southern limit,—intending, it would appear, not so much to introduce a system of idolatrous worship as to follow the example of Aaron, whose words he quoted at the consecration, and symbolically represent the Deity who had brought the nation forth from Egypt.[4] Jeroboam had also, from the same motive of policy, expelled the Levites his territory, and constituted a new priesthood from the popular ranks. These infringements of the Mosaic ritual were signally punished. In the very act of consecration, the altar was rent and the king's arm withered;[5] and when the policy thus

The symbolism was the same in both, differences occurring in detail, not in theological significance. Compare Bähr, *Der Salomonische Tempel*, 1848; Keil, *Der Tempel Salomo's*, 1839; Merz, article "Tempel zu Jerusalem," in Herzog and Plitt, vol. xv.; and the exposition of the 6th and 7th chapters of 1 Kings, in Thenius, *Commentar zu der BB. der Könige*, 2nd ed. 1873, pp. 56–124.

[1] 1 Kings viii. 62–64. [2] 1 Kings xi. 4–13. [3] 1 Kings xii. 26–33.
[4] Michaelis, *Mosaisches Recht*, 1770, p. 255. [5] 1 Kings xiii. 1–6.

rashly commenced was persisted in, the penalty subsequently took the severer form of the death of Jeroboam's only son.[1] From that time on, in the "nine dynasties and nineteen kings,"[2] it was plainly seen that no shechinah rested upon the new sanctuaries, but that, by faction fights in which kings were overthrown and their families murdered, by horrible anarchy, by the harassing inroads of the dwellers on the marches, and the overwhelming invasions of the great Asiatic monarchies, by plague, locusts, and earthquakes, by human and physical instruments of various kinds, the penalties that had been decreed were falling. Once on the plane of decadence, everything seemed rushing with increasing momentum to the final issue. The worship of the calves loosened the sluices which inundated the land with the sanguinary and unchaste worship of Baal and the Ashtaroth; and the sins of the house of Jeroboam being eclipsed by those of the house of Omri, these in turn paling before the iniquities of the house of Jehu, the divine wrath not only became more clearly pronounced in the warnings of the successive prophets, but the several reigns themselves appeared to the observant eyes of the elect increasingly fraught with the elements of destruction. Indeed, in the general disasters which had fallen upon church and home and state, it is refreshing to catch an occasional glimpse of a few peaceful and standstill days under such an one as an Ahab, or of the less declared and more politic iniquity of a Jehu. At length the Ten Tribes succumbed to the might of Assyria, and, in accordance with the custom of Asiatic conquerors, were transplanted into Assyria and its tributaries, Dan and Bethel standing thenceforth as imperishable monuments of the widespread forgetfulness of the divine law and the unflinching severity of the divine judgments.

In the kingdom of Judah the course of events was not so uniformly detrimental, and times of precious revival were more frequently distributed amidst the periods of irreligion. The changes in Judah were reformations and not revolutions. The dynasty of David never became extinct, and during all vicissitudes the Temple at Jerusalem, with its inseparable

[1] 1 Kings xiv. 12, 13.

[2] Oehler, *Theologie des A. T.*, vol. ii. p. 55, § 171.

and potent associations, uttered a protest against the national degeneracy. Yet, although Judah was free from the deadly feuds which distracted Ephraim, she was not free from Ephraim's sin. Idolatry in its most detestable forms competed successfully with the religion of Jehovah for the hearts of the people; the licentious sacrifices of the groves rose into the air with the sacrifices from the altar of burnt-offering; at times the sacred precincts of the Holy of Holies itself were polluted by the emblematic regalia of strange gods. More tender, however, was the treatment of the Divine Father, because more frequent was the fitful adherence of Judah to His worship. When the idolatries of an Abijah were succeeded by the iconoclasm of an Asa, Asa marched victoriously against invading Egypt. The national annals, telling as they do of the godless reigns of an Athaliah and a Jehoram, are also brightened by those of a Jehoshaphat, a Joash, and a Hezekiah, the days of Jehoshaphat being eloquent of the deliverance from the Assyrian, those of Joash of the defeat of the Syrian, and those of Hezekiah of the retrogression of the dial in answer to importunate prayer. Nevertheless, the judgments so long deferred at length fell. The armies of Babylon encircled Jerusalem, and, after making it tributary during the reign of Jehoiachin, first carried a part of the inhabitants with their king Jehoiachin captive, and subsequently transplanted the entire community to the rivers of Babylon. The streams of sacrificial blood no longer flowed in the court of the Temple; the Temple itself lay in ruins.

To the later features of the biblical history, which more appropriately belong to our next chapter, a few words may beneficially be given. "One of the most mysterious and momentous periods in the history of humanity was that brief space of the exile. What were the influences brought to bear upon the captives during that time, we know not. But this we know, that from a reckless, lawless, godless populace, they returned transformed into a band of Puritans."[1] "What all the better kings and prophets had never been able, with even tolerable success, to effect in Israel, was accomplished in a few short years, without much aid from man, by the inflexible

[1] Emanuel Deutsch, *Literary Remains*, p. 12.

earnestness of that life on a foreign soil."[1] The furnace of affliction had at length indelibly branded upon the national heart the sense of the paramount importance of the Mosaic worship: and no sooner were the captives restored to their native land than their first deed was to rebuild the Temple; and although, to quote the Talmud, this Temple of Zerubbabel wanted five things which constituted the glory of that of Solomon,—namely, the ark, the sacred fire, the shechinah, the spirit of prophecy, and the oracle,—none the less were the foundations laid with shouting and the topstone brought forth with joy.[2] From the days of the renewal of the covenant by the princes, Levites, and priests "to walk in God's law, which was given by Moses the servant of God,"[3] the lesson had been adequately learnt, that in other gods and in idolatrous sacrifices there was no avail. Thenceforth there was no return to the heathen propensities of their fathers, and during the dreary days of the Persian, Macedonian, and Roman supremacies, when scholarship took the place of inspiration, and sects argued where prophets had intuitively seen, it was quite another lesson, as we shall presently see, which was being enforced—that of the transitory nature of Mosaism itself.

[1] Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 3d ed. vol. iv. p. 30.
[2] Ezra iii. 10, 11. [3] Neh. x. 29.

CHAPTER II.

THE HAGIOGRAPHIC CONCEPTION OF MOSAIC SACRIFICE.

"It is natural to believe in great men."—EMERSON, *Representative Men.*

IN addition to the Books of the Law written by the divinely inspired Moses, and those historical books professedly written by the prophets to enforce a theocratic view of the current of Hebrew history (written with an unconcealed bias, it may allowably be said), it was the privilege of the chosen people to possess a literature in the narrower sense of the word. This fact was distinctly recognised in the formation of the Hebrew canon; for, whilst the first division of that canon consisted of the Law, and the second of the Prophets (containing, be it remembered, those historical books which have formed the subject of the preceding chapter, as well as the predictive books which will form the subject of the next), there was also a third division, the Hagiographa or Holy Writings, —a literature, as has been hinted, in the narrower and more frequent sense of the term. This literature was partly history and partly poetry,—that is to say, it consisted in part of facts so selected and pieced together by conscious or unconscious art as to be powerfully representative of certain given epochs or events, and in part of expressions under some appropriate form of the inner life of highly gifted men. One peculiarity, however, severed the Jewish literature from the literature of other nations—these writings were pre-eminently *Holy Writings.* As, generally speaking, it may be said that the genius of Greece lay in the sense of the beautiful, and that of Rome in the sense of the political, so, generally speaking, the Jewish genius may be said to lie in the sense of the spiritual. It was

not the sensuous relations between the mind of man and the glories of the outer world which occupied the chief place in the studies of the Jewish sage, though these were not unfelt; nor was it the gregarious and governing instincts which form man into societies, though these were not unknown: a David and a Solomon principally occupied themselves with the mysterious relations between man and the unseen universe. This common bent of Jewish genius is very evident in the Hagiographa. All the books of the Old Testament are concerned in some way or other with the culture of the religious side of humanity: the Hagiographa differ from the Law and the Prophets, inasmuch as they teach rather by example than precept, and relate the religious life either of individuals or epochs, as that was displayed in the ordinary course of providence rather than in direct divine communications. To speak more accurately, the *Ketubim* or Hagiographa differ from the *Torah* and *Nebiyim*, inasmuch as the inspiration of the former is seen indirectly in the narrative or experience of inspired lives of men and peoples, whereas the inspiration of the Law and Prophets is seen directly in express divine announcements. Now these holy books had considerable influence in assisting the national assimilation of the Mosaic law. It is therefore needful to inquire at this stage of our inquiry, what is the teaching concerning sacrifice to be found in these holy books.

The historical books of the Hagiographa consist of the Books of Ruth, the Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and Daniel. Of these the prophecies of the Book of Daniel, which fitly find their place in this collection, since their remarkable predictions are after all but incidental to the historical contents of the book, will be more advantageously examined in our next chapter, and the Books of Ruth and Esther have nothing relevant to our inquiry. The remaining books may well call for investigation; for one prominent feature of them is the leading position everywhere ascribed to the Mosaic cultus, and the reverence its commands are everywhere described as obtaining. So conspicuous, indeed, is the place which the Levitical worship occupies in the Books of the Chronicles, that some rationalists and critics

have not hesitated to assert they were written by Levites in the ecclesiastical interest.[1]

The poetical books of the Hagiographa are the Books of Job, the Psalms, the Proverbs of Solomon, the Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, and the Lamentations. Of these the Book of Job describes too primitive a time to render any aid, and the Canticles have no direct reference to our subject. The Books of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Lamentations, cursory as their allusions to sacrifice are, are of importance from their expression of the individual views of their authors. The Psalms are also of incomputable value, from their overflowing fulness of experience. These Psalms, indeed, attributed to such authors as Moses, David, Solomon, and Isaiah, are sacred lyrics, which, from the almost idolized reputation of their composers, from the contagious glow of their sentiments, and the religious tone of that instruction which, better far than any didactic poem, they contrived to convey, must, from their frequent use in public worship, as well as their intrinsic literary merit, have played no inconsiderable part in the fashioning of the spiritual life of those who were capable of profiting by their teaching, and have had incalculable influence in stamping the leading features of the Jewish faith upon the popular mind.

In turning to the historical books of the Hagiographa, to ascertain what elements of example and teaching they contain which could aid the national assimilation of the sacrificial injunctions given by Moses, it is noticeable, in the first place, that they acknowledge throughout the religious satisfaction to be found in the sacrificial enactments of Mosaism. We do not allude to the evidence that the Mosaic law was in force; we have before said that such evidence is, from our standpoint, unnecessary. We allude to the overwhelming proof of the fact that, whenever cravings after divine communion arose in crises in individual or national life, those cravings

[1] "These books are the first to show us that, amid all the transgressions of the law and the greatly abounding idolatry, the worship of Jehovah was still kept up on the whole as the Pentateuch prescribed, in spite of occasional brief periods in which it was almost entirely neglected."—Keil, *Lehrbuch der historisch-krit. Einleitung in die canon. Schriften des A. T.*, 2nd ed. 1859 (translated in *Foreign Theological Library*), § 140.

were allayed by the divinely appointed services of the Tabernacle or Temple. The ordinary chronicles of the Jewish nation are full of instances where exceptional men, at exceptional times, rejoiced to direct the popular eye to the abundant satisfaction they had in worshipping God in His own prescribed way. As the ark of the testimony was brought to its resting-place at Zion, David sacrificed with joy and dancing, thus publicly testifying to his sense of the spiritual privileges he was permitted to share.[1] At the consecration of the Temple, itself a visible witness to the joyful participation of David and Solomon in the Mosaic ritual, king and people, so glad were they and merry, brought their thousands of burnt-offerings and peace-offerings.[2] Subsequently, at the solemn dedication of Zerubbabel's Temple, the nation "kept the feast of Unleavened Bread seven days with joy: for the Lord had made them joyful."[3] Or, turning to examples of another class, we find David, in the hour of his terror at the rapid spread of the plague, offering sacrifice to avert the divine anger;[4] and Jehoshaphat, in despair at a dreaded invasion, standing in the court of the Temple, and crying, "O Lord God of our fathers, art Thou not God in heaven?"[5] But it is needless to multiply instances. The historical books teem with such examples; and it is very evident that one great element in effecting the popular assimilation of the Mosaic injunctions, lay in the lasting example of men like David, Hezekiah, and Ezra, and in the lasting remembrance of great crises such as the dedication of the Temple, when, after recourse to the divinely instituted method of divine approach, the "arm of the Lord was made bare."

Another feature which is very prominent in the historical books under examination, and which must also have exercised considerable influence in the ready assimilation by the people of the Mosaic cultus in its entirety, is the frequent recognition of the necessity of what we have called the subjective side of sacrifice. If great men and great events drew the gaze of the populace to the inestimable treasures they possessed in the Law, not less clearly did those great men and great events

[1] 1 Chron. xvi. [2] 2 Chron. vii. 4–10. [3] Ezra vi. 22.
[4] 1 Chron. xxi. 26. [5] 2 Chron. xx. 3–12.

draw the attention of all to the inward character of true religion. If David appointed the sons of Aaron to offer sacrifices in their due season, he reminded them that their duty was "to stand every morning to thank and praise the Lord, and likewise at even."[1] It was when the trumpeters and singers made one mighty sound of praise, "For His mercy endureth for ever," as well as when the priests slaughtered their offerings, that the Temple was filled with the glory of the Lord like a cloud.[2] Fire came down from heaven when Solomon completed his sacrifice by prayer.[3] The secret of Hezekiah's prosperity lay in the fact that all the work he did in the service of the house of God and the Law, "he did with all his heart."[4]

If we now peruse the poetical writings of the Hagiographa, we find, in the first place, that language has never expressed more forcibly the craving after some form of religious worship; and, further, that language has never recognised more clearly the abundant satisfaction of that craving to be gained in the sacrificial enactments of Mosaism. The same book that contains those exquisite devotional outbursts, "O God, Thou art my God; early will I seek Thee: my soul thirsteth for Thee, my flesh longeth after Thee,"[5] tells of a spiritual rest that can prompt the words, "I will freely sacrifice unto Thee, . . . for it is good."[6] In one place we read the confession of the Psalmist: "As the hart panteth after the water-brooks, so panteth my soul after Thee, O God;"[7] in another there is the rejoicing cry: "I will go into Thy house with burnt-offerings: I will pay Thee my vows, which my lips have uttered, and my mouth hath spoken, when I was in trouble. I will bring Thee fat calves, with the sweet savour of rams: I will offer bullocks with he-goats."[8] As that cry of the Psalmist, more loud than the wailings and immolations of heathendom, is wrung from his heart in the secret chamber, where, with his awakened conscience, he is alone with God, "For Thy name's sake, pardon mine iniquity, for it is great;"[9] from afar the singers of Zion may have been heard sending

[1] 1 Chron. xxiii. 30. [2] 2 Chron. v. 13, 14. [3] 2 Chron. vii. 1.
[4] 2 Chron. xxxi. 21. [5] Ps. lxiii. 1. [6] Ps. liv. 6.
[7] Ps. xliii. 1. [8] Ps. lxvi. 13–15. [9] Ps. xxv. 11, comp. li. 1.

forth their refrain: "Bring an offering, and come into His courts."[1] In many forms of language the spiritual value of Mosaism is urged. Now, with dramatic power the nation is represented as praying for its king: "The Lord . . . remember all thy sacrifices, and regard thy burnt-sacrifices as fat;"[2] and now, with equal dramatic force, the Lord is represented as commanding His angels to "gather His saints; those who have made a covenant with Him by festal-offering."[3] At one time sacrificing is spoken of as a means of spiritual renewal: "But He, full of compassion, *covered* their iniquity and destroyed them not;"[4] at another time, as expressive of consecration after renewal: "Hear, O Lord, when I cry with my voice. . . . Then will I offer in His Tabernacle jubilant thank-offerings; I will sing, yea, I will play the harp unto the Lord."[5] "I will offer to Thee thank-offerings,"[6] is the exclamation of the Psalmist as he remembers the wonders of the divine deliverance; "Oh that men would praise the Lord for His goodness!" he exclaims, as the conviction grows that that deliverance is universally displayed, "and let them slay thank-offerings."[7] "Honour the Lord with thy substance, and the first-fruits of thine increase,"[8] says the writer of the Proverbs: "He that keepeth the Law, happy is he;"[9] "The trespass-offering mocketh fools."[10]

The poetical section of the Hagiographa also speaks with stern and uncompromising severity of the folly and tremendous consequences of iniquitous sacrificial observance. Like a death-knell, for example, sounds the wail of Jeremiah from amidst the ruins of Jerusalem: "I called for my lovers, they deceived me: my priests and my elders gave up the ghost in the city, while they sought food to relieve their souls. . . . The punishment of the iniquity of the daughter of my people is greater than the punishment of the sin of Sodom. . . . The stones of the sanctuary are poured out in every street. . . . He hath violently taken away His Tabernacle, as if it were a garden: He hath destroyed His places of assembly:

[1] Ps. xcvi. 8. [2] Ps. xx. 3. [3] Ps. l. 5.
[4] Ps. lxxviii. 38. [5] Ps. xxvii. 6. [6] Ps. cxvi. 17.
[7] Ps. cvii. 21, 22. [8] Prov. iii. 9. [9] Prov. xxix. 18.
[10] Prov. xiv. 9.

the Lord hath caused the solemn feasts and the Sabbaths to be forgotten in Zion, and hath despised in the indignation of His anger the king and the priest. The Lord hath cast off His altar, He hath abhorred His sanctuary. . . . The Nazarites were purer than snow; their skin is withered: it is like a stick."[1]

But if the poetical books of the Hagiographa everywhere recognise the importance of what we have called the objective side of sacrifice, they no less emphatically teach the necessity of the subjective side. "Who shall abide in Thy Tabernacle?" asks one of the Psalms; "He that walketh uprightly,"[2] is the reply. "I will wash my hands in innocency," sings the worshipper: "so will I compass Thine altar, O Lord."[3] "O send out Thy light and Thy truth!" is David's cry in distress: "let them bring me to Thy holy hill, and to Thy Tabernacle."[4] If the Psalmist would depict the divine regard of the slaughtered victims presented by priests, "Will I eat the flesh of bulls or drink the blood of goats?" are the words he puts into the mouth of the Almighty: "Offer unto God thanksgiving;"[5] "Offer the blood sacrifices[6] of righteousness."[7] In his deepest contrition David whispers to his harp: "Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it: Thou delightest not in burnt-offering. The blood sacrifices of God are a broken spirit."[8] And at another time: "None of

[1] Lam. i. 19, iv. 6, iv. 1, ii. 6, 7, iv. 7, 8.
[2] Ps. xv. 1, 2.
[3] Ps. xxvi. 6.
[4] Ps. xliii. 3, 4.
[5] Ps. l. 12–14.

[6] The author has not thought it advisable to crowd his notes by referring to the numerous passages in this and the following chapter, in which he has felt it necessary to deviate from the Authorized or even the Revised Versions; nor has he given, except in very exceptional instances, the exegetical reasons for the translation he has adopted. He would say, once for all, that wherever the Authorized Version and Revised Version have not, in his esteem, concealed important turns of phrase, he has not gone out of his way to insert minute shades of meaning, which have more to do with style than doctrine; and in such cases he has been satisfied with the Englishman's Bible. The author would also add, that he has not referred to the numerous commentaries by means of which he has formed, corrected, or matured his exegetical opinions. He cannot refrain, however, from gratefully acknowledging the valuable assistance he has received in his Old Testament studies from the commentaries of Hitzig and Knobel, Delitzsch and Hengstenberg; and, quite apart from the critical views of that distinguished Orientalist, the author would also express his grateful appreciation of Ewald's sympathetic translations of the Old Testament poets and prophets.

[7] Ps. iv. 5.
[8] Ps. li. 16.

the round of sacrifices dost Thou desire; mine ears hast Thou opened: neither burnt-offerings nor sin-offerings dost Thou require. . . . Lo, I come."[1] And conspicuous among the Proverbs are such as these: "The blood sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord;"[2] "Better is a dry morsel, and quietness therewith, than a house full of festal offerings with strife;"[3] "To do justice and judgment is more acceptable to the Lord than blood sacrifice."[4] "Be more ready to hear," is the abrupt advice of the cynical preacher, "than to give the blood sacrifice of fools."[5]

There is another feature of the doctrinal substratum of the Psalms which must not be entirely passed over—namely, what is customarily designated their Messianic conceptions. As in the Patriarchal and Mosaic Ages, so in the post-Mosaic the gospel of deliverance by sacrifice and the gospel of deliverance by a coming Messiah still run side by side. This Messianic element it has been the earnest endeavours of the contra-predictive school of expositors to eliminate or minimize. They have made it their special aim to discover—we had almost said, to ferret out—any historical events or circumstances which might be supposed to form the starting-point of the so-called Messianic Psalms, hoping thus to render an adequate explanation of those Psalms, if but a little poetic licence be also allowed. The result has been not only to stimulate a closer study of the historical allusions everywhere contained or assumed, and thus to foster a more vivid apprehension of these holy writings, but also to demonstrate more and more convincingly the impossibility of getting rid of the Messianic interpretations. Recent studies have compelled the relinquishment of some Psalms which had previously been regarded as prophetic of the coming Deliverer, only to bring into stronger and more indisputable prominence others which unquestionably have such a reference. The conclusion has also been increasingly forced upon the mind, that this Messianic element is not to be seen in isolated passages and allusions so much as in an all-pervasive, interpenetrating atmosphere, surely present, yet subtly indescribable. The Psalms, it is being recognised,

[1] Ps. xl. 6, 7. [2] Prov. xv. 8. [3] Prov. xvii. 1.
[4] Prov. xxi. 3. [5] Eccles. v. 1.

transport the sympathetic reader into the quietude of the Messianic hope, as the poetry of Wordsworth transports into the quietude of nature; they act by a communicative suggestiveness, verbally incommunicable. As has been well said by the present Dean of Canterbury, the composition of the Psalms "may have begun with man, but it ends with God; it may have begun with some event or person belonging to the preparatory church, but it moves onward and rises to a fuller and nobler—yes, and a truer—meaning. Psalms occasioned by some temporary occurrence, prayers bursting from hearts overcharged with emotions arising from present mercies, narratives and persons in strictest harmony with their times, yet leave constantly those times far behind, and suggest thoughts of Christ, and shed light upon His office and work for us. If it were mere spiritualizing,—a far-fetched or forced interpretation,—it would have no argumentative force, however capable it might be of adaptation to pious uses. If this occurred once only, or twice, or ten times, you might say it was chance work. But the interpretation is natural, obvious, plain. It is so general a rule, . . . that you do not get rid of its force by hunting up with petty minuteness some present occurrence to which the declaration . . . may in some few cases here and there possibly refer."[1] An illustration of this Messianic suggestiveness of the Psalms has been neatly put by Lowth in his celebrated *Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews*: "The subject of the second Psalm is the establishment of David upon the throne, agreeably to the Almighty decree, notwithstanding the fruitless opposition of his enemies. The character which David sustains in this poem is twofold, literal and allegorical (typical). If on the first reading of the Psalm we consider the character of David in the literal sense, the composition appears sufficiently perspicuous, and abundantly illustrated by facts from the sacred history. Through the whole, indeed, there is an unusual fervour of language, a brilliancy of metaphor; and sometimes the diction is uncommonly elevated, as if to intimate that something of a more sublime and important nature lay concealed within, and as if the poet had some intention of admitting us to the secret recesses

[1] Payne Smith, *Prophecy a Preparation for Christ*, p. 246.

of his subject. If, in consequence of this indication, we turn our minds to contemplate the internal sense, and apply the same passages to the allegorical David, a nobler series of events is presented to us, and a meaning not only more sublime, but even more perspicuous, rises to the view. Should anything at first appear bolder and more elevated than the obvious sense would bear, it will now at once appear clear, expressive, and admirably adapted to the dignity of the principal subject. If, after having considered the subjects attentively apart, we examine them at length in a united view, the beauty and sublimity of this most elegant poem will be improved. We may then perceive the vast disparity of the two images, and yet the continual harmony and agreement that subsists between them, the amazing resemblance, as between near relations, in every feature and lineament, and the accurate analogy which is preserved, so that either may pass for the original whence the other was copied. New light is reflected upon the diction, and a degree of dignity and importance is added to the sentiments, whilst they gradually rise from humble to more elevated objects, from human to divine, till at length the great subject of the poem is placed in the most conspicuous light, and the composition attains the highest point of sublimity." [1]

So much for the existence of Messianic Psalms. A detailed examination of these Psalms would be out of place; for this reference may be made to any more recent commentary. Nor is it necessary to describe the gradual growth of the Messianic ideas as that may be traced in the extant Psalms,—an impossible task, it must be admitted, until unanimity has crowned the attempt at solving the perplexing questions of their authorship and chronology. All it is necessary to our argument to do, is to draw attention to the fact that, amidst numerous allusions to the office of the Messiah, which only subsequently receive their adequate explanation, the most prominent feature of the Messianic teaching of the Psalms is the Kingship of this Anointed One. The coming Deliverer is everywhere placed in the forefront as "great David's greater Son."

[1] Lowth, vol. i. Lecture xi.

Thus, whatever influence heroic example, historical precedent, and exceptional literature exercise upon national and private life, that influence, as we have now seen, was exercised in the assimilation of the Mosaic ritual. The recital of cherished tradition, the reading of written chronicles, and the choral worship of the sanctuary, each did its part. Whenever the Psalms were sung, or the Hagiographa perused; whenever parents told the national exploits to their children, or orators to their audience, a subtle and immeasurable agency was at work in recalling to mind the injunctions of the Law, and how the wisest and greatest had not only advocated an incessant obedience, but attributed their outward and spiritual prosperity to that obedience.

CHAPTER III

THE PROPHETICAL CONCEPTION OF MOSAIC SACRIFICE.

"It were much to be wished that we could agree upon a chronological arrangement of the Old Testament, which would approach more nearly to the true order in which the books were written than that in which they have been handed down to us. Such an arrangement would throw great light on the interpretation of prophecy."—JOWETT, *The Epistles of Paul*, vol. ii. p. 283.

HAVING treated in the preceding chapters of the assimilation of the Mosaic injunctions effected by the national history, and by the example and writings of men of extraordinary piety, we now advance to the third movement which characterized the interval from Moses to John the Baptist, and investigate the assimilation and development effected by the prophets.

It was one of the main tasks of prophecy to take the two parallel rays of the sacrificial teaching of Mosaism and the Messianic teaching, and by bringing them into a focus to project upon subsequent ages one beam of intense light. From the days of Abel two revelations had been given with increasing clearness,—the one of salvation by sacrifice, and the other of salvation by a promised Deliverer; but although the forms in which these two revelations had been conveyed had pointed to the future for their adequate explanation, nothing had as yet indisputably shown that they were indissolubly connected, nothing had shown that the anticipated deliverance would be deliverance by an antitypical sacrifice. Even in the Psalms, which speak so exultantly of the regal and priestly status of the Divine Deliverer, these two cardinal truths of pre-Christian times are not so presented as that their hearers must unquestioningly believe in a Saviour who should give Himself a potent and eternal sacrifice for man. Suggestions

many the Psalms contain, assurances never. It was prophecy which conducted the Mosaic doctrine of Sacrifice through this new phase.

In that mental product to which the name of prophecy has been applied, the most extraordinary achievement of pre-Christian times is witnessed. The Jewish prophet was neither a Demosthenes, swaying the multitudes by a brilliant expression of political views which revealed acumen and talent for government without any admixture of the supernatural; nor was he a Pindar, who roused his fellow-countrymen by the recitation of epics daring in their fancy and sublime in their execution, yet none the less never transcending the limits of human genius: his special gift was supernatural in its source, and had the supernatural for its subject; he was *a speaker for God,—an interpreter of the divine mind,*[1] who, having been chosen to utter messages from heaven, knew no medium so fitting as lofty eloquence and rich poetry. A prophet is etymologically "a speaker out,—one who reveals the mind and sayings of another who never speaks; just as the dumb man or a recluse must have some one to speak out for him and declare his intentions, so God, who is dumb to the multitude, must have a messenger or an interpreter divinely commissioned to speak the divine will."[2] "The idea of a *nabhi* is not limited to the functions of a seer and predicter of *future* events; neither does the term denote (as many in modern times suppose) every poet or teacher of the people; it conveys the notion of an interpreter between God and man,—a confidant, as it were, of God,—one to whom Jehovah manifests Himself in order to announce to men that which He desires that they shall know, referring either to future events, or to the disclosure of divine mysteries, or even to instruction in moral laws."[3] "A prophet as regarded in the

[1] See the Hebrew word *nabhi*, which may be translated *spokesman* or *interpreter*, or, better still, *a speaker who is simply the organ of another*. Compare Ewald, *Ausführliches Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache*, §§ 124. *a*, and 149. *e*, 2, 8th ed. pp. 329 and 388; and Oehler's article, "Propheten des A. T.," in Herzog, vol. xii. p. 210. Προφήτης, the Greek word of the Septuagint, is an unexceptionable equivalent.

[2] Ewald, *Die Propheten des Alten Bundes*, 1840, p. 6.

[3] Bleek, *Einleitung in die heil. Schrift des A. T.*, Eng. Trans. vol. ii. p. 6.

light of Scripture, was simply the recipient and bearer of a message from God; and such a message was of course a prophecy, whatever might be its more specific character,—whether the disclosure of some important truth, the inculcation of an imperative duty, or a prospective delineation of future events."[1] "The prophet, then, was the representative of God under the theocratic government,—the vizier or deputy, whose business it was to speak in God's name."[2] "The word which the prophet reveals can be ascribed as little to natural reflection as to such human instruction or direction as obtained in the schools of the prophets; and if the prophet in the assurance of his divine mission encountered an Ahaz and a Jezebel, an Ahab, a Jehoiachin, a Zedekiah,—yea, the whole multitude of his opponents,—with the strongest opposition, and fearlessly invoked the powers of heaven to assist him, all this must be attributed to his innermost assurance that he was *the organ of God*."[3] If it be asked how the prophet became conscious of this his exalted function, the response must be: "The prophet knew himself as the organ of the divine revelation, by virtue, on the one hand, of his divine call which had fallen upon him with overpowering conviction, and was immediately recognisable as such; and, on the other hand, by virtue of his preparation by the Spirit of God, which enlightened, sanctified, and strengthened him."[4] This honour of being the privileged receiver and promulgator of the divine revelations was confined to no special family or tribe (like the office of the priesthood), but wherever God willed, the call to the prophetical office fell; and sometimes by the medium of dreams or of that visionary state in which, the eyes being closed, the seer simply regarded the things revealed to his inner consciousness, sometimes by the immediate impartation of truth, the divine call was ratified and consummated.

From the biblical conception of the nature of prophecy just deduced, a consequence follows which at once brings that conception into strong relief, and facilitates the comprehension of

[1] Fairbairn, *On Prophecy*, p. 5 (T. & T. Clark).
[2] Payne Smith, *Prophecy a Preparation for Christ*, p. 71.
[3] Küper, *Das Prophetenthum des Alten Bundes*, 1870, p. 16.
[4] Oehler, *Theologie des A. T.*, vol. ii. p. 172, § 206.

what would otherwise be a startling discrepancy in the Old Testament teaching upon sacrifice. The Mosaic law strictly enjoined, under capital penalties, that sacrifices should never be offered except at the Tabernacle and by the Levitical priesthood; but the prophets, nevertheless, are represented as sacrificing without priestly assistance and in places remote from the Court. One notorious instance is Elijah's sacrifice at Carmel. That the prophets in such cases did no wrong, the divine sanction sufficiently testifies. The reason is clear. The Law was primarily given through the prophet Moses, and every subsequent prophet was a law to himself. By virtue of his divine vocation, the prophet could obey the will of God as revealed within, the priest as revealed without. The prophet, in fact, occupied an analogous position to that of the angel whose command legalized the sacrifices of Gideon[1] before his own door. In short, from his direct intercourse with the Most High, the prophetic conscience was as authoritative as the Sinaitic commands. In illustration of this position, another remarkable fact may be adduced,—viz., that no change was ever legitimately made in the Mosaic law, except upon some such revelation as constituted the very essence of the prophetic office. When changes were first made in the Aaronic and Levitical arrangements, they were made by Samuel:[2] every feature in which the Temple of Solomon differed from the Tabernacle, was authorized by divine revelation to David;[3] and the peculiarities of construction in the second Temple had their source in Haggai and Ezekiel.[4]

Adam was the first prophet, and from his days onwards occasional outbursts of the prophetic spirit are met with in Jacob, Balaam, and Moses, until, in the days of Samuel, the gift was so richly bestowed that it was continued uninterruptedly in poorer or more lavish measure until the canon of the Old Testament closed. It is undoubtedly true that we do not possess the complete utterances of the prophets, since the didactic teachings of a Samuel, an Elijah, and an Elisha (to say nothing of the lesser lights of the "schools") are not extant. But it was in the days of the Divided Empire, so

[1] Judg. xiii. 16–20.
[2] 1 Chron. ix. 22.
[3] 1 Chron. xxviii. 19.
[4] Ezek. xl.–xlvi., and Hag. i. 7–14.

important in the spiritual history of the Jews, and especially in those days when the accumulated sins of the nation were about to be punished by the hosts of Assyria and Chaldea, that prophecy flourished; and extended records of those times have been preserved to us. From the writings of Obadiah and Joel; from the productions of the contemporaries Jonah, Amos, and Hosea, who prepared the way for the nobler Isaiah; from the remaining pre-exilian prophecies of Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, and Jeremiah; from the important prophecies of the exile emanating from Haggai, Ezekiel, and Daniel; and from the final utterances of Zechariah and Malachi, the main contents of the prophetic teaching may be deduced.

In the study of the prophetic writings with reference to the subject of this treatise, the first fact that strikes one is that a considerable portion of those writings is intentionally devoted to the enforcement of what had already been more or less clearly taught in the Law and national literature.[1] The Hebrew prophets were conservative liberals, who, while they predicted and prepared the way for the golden age ahead, made it a large part of their endeavours to gather and refurbish the good things of the past. This aspect of the prophetical writings has been too much neglected, such neglect having been the cause of the current misconception which makes scriptural prophecy synonymous with prediction. "Prediction is part of prophecy; for, as the past and the future are both present to God, one in whom God spake would be raised above the limits of time, provided that this elevation were needed by that portion of God's truth which he was commissioned to deliver; but if, as was often the case with the prophets, their office related to the present state of God's church, no prediction would be spoken."[2] Predict the prophets did that they might teach, and predict they did concerning sacrifice; but their teaching was not confined to prediction: prophecy was also concerned in emphatically reiterating the doctrine of Sacrifice previously given.

[1] "If we take up the prophetic volume, we find it readily distinguishes itself into two parts, which may be called the Moral or Doctrinal, and the Predictive."—Davison, *On Prophecy*, 6th ed. p. 28.

[2] Payne Smith, *Prophecy a Preparation for Christ*, p. 41.

The prophets frequently reiterated the importance of the Mosaic injunctions as a means of religious worship. "O Judah," cries Nahum, "keep thy solemn feasts, perform thy vows: for the wicked one shall no more pass through thee; he is utterly cut off." [1] "And the word of the Lord," says Zechariah, "came unto me, saying, Thus saith the Lord of hosts: The fast of the fourth month, and the fast of the fifth, and the fast of the seventh, and the fast of the tenth, shall be to the house of Judah joy and gladness, and cheerful feasts; therefore love the truth and peace." [2] Haggai exhorts to the rebuilding of the Temple with such words as these: "Thus saith the Lord of hosts: Consider your ways. Go up to the mountain and bring wood, and build the house, that I may take pleasure in it, and that I may be glorified, saith the Lord. Ye looked for much, and, lo, there came little; and when ye brought it home, I blew it away. Why? saith the Lord of hosts. Because of mine house which is waste, whilst ye run every man to his own house. Therefore the heavens over you are stayed from dew, and the earth is stayed from her fruit." [3] But the most astonishing repetition of the past is the emphasis laid upon the Mosaic injunctions in the vision of Ezekiel concerning the new Temple to be built on the ruins of the old.[4]

The prophets painted in lurid colours the consequences of iniquitous sacrificial observance. "Hear this," is the passionate denunciation of Amos, "O ye that swallow up the needy, . . . saying, When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn? and the Sabbath, that we may set forth wheat, making the ephah small, and the shekel great? . . . The Lord hath sworn by the excellency of Jacob, Surely I will never forget any of their works;" [5]—"I hate, I despise your feast-days, and I will not smell in your solemn assemblies. Though ye offer me burnt-offerings and your meat-offerings, I will not accept them; neither will I regard the peace-offerings of your fatted calves. . . . Have ye offered unto me the whole round of sacrifices in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel? But ye have borne the tabernacle of your king, and the car of your

[1] Nah. i. 15. [2] Zech. viii. 19. [3] Hag. i. 7–10.
[4] Ezek. xl.–xlviii. [5] Amos viii. 4–7.

images, the star of your god, which ye made to yourselves. Therefore will I cause you to go into captivity beyond Damascus, saith the Lord, Whose name is the God of hosts." [1] "My people," writes Hosea, "ask counsel at their stocks, and their staff declares unto them. . . . They sacrifice upon the tops of the mountains, and burn incense upon the hills, under oaks and poplars and elms. . . . Ephraim is joined to idols: let him alone." [2] "What profiteth the graven image," is the Lord's reply to Habakkuk, "that the maker thereof hath graven it; the figure of a mould, and a teacher of lies, that the maker of his work trusteth therein, to make dumb idols? Woe unto him that saith to the wood, Awake; to the dumb stone, Arise." [3] Or more melancholy than any verbal denunciation is the matter-of-fact description of the desolateness which fell upon that Temple which had so often witnessed the idolatries and hypocrisies of priests and people: "Now in the fifth month, in the tenth day of the month, which was the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, came Nebuzaradan, captain of the guard, which served the king of Babylon, into Jerusalem, and burned the house of the Lord, and the king's house; and all the houses of Jerusalem, and all the houses of the great men, burned he with fire: and all the army of the Chaldeans, that were with the captain of the guard, brake down all the walls of Jerusalem round about." [4]

Tenderly or with threatening, the prophets dwelt upon the necessity of what has been so frequently called the subjective side of sacrifice. "Gird yourselves, and lament," is the exhortation of Joel, "ye priests: howl, ye ministers of the altar: come, lie all night in sackcloth, ye ministers of my God." [5] "Take with you words," is the advice of Hosea to sinful Samaria,—"Take with you words, and turn to the Lord: say unto Him, Take away all iniquity, and receive us graciously; and let us render *the calves of our lips*." [6] "Wherewith," asks Micah, "shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the God of heights? shall I come before Him with burnt-offerings, with calves a year old? Will the Lord be pleased

[1] Amos v. 21–27. [2] Hos. iv. 12–17. [3] Hab. ii. 18, 19.
[4] Jer. lii. 12–23. [5] Joel i. 13. [6] Hos. xiv. 2.

with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"[1] "Circumcise *yourselves* to the Lord, and remove *the foreskin of your heart*,"[2] is the cry of Jeremiah to Judah.

Then with no faltering voice did the prophets pronounce upon the transitional nature of Mosaic sacrifice. Zephaniah writes: "Therefore as I live, saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, Surely Moab shall be as Sodom, and the children of Ammon as Gomorrah. . . . The Lord will be terrible unto them: for He will bring to nought all the gods of the earth; and all the isles shall worship Him, *every one in his own place*."[3] Joel places in the divine mouth promises of satisfaction for those religious desires which were unmet in Mosaism, saying: "Judah shall dwell for ever, and Jerusalem from generation to generation. And I will cleanse their blood that I have not cleansed: for the Lord dwelleth in Zion."[4] Haggai encourages the builders of the second Temple by reciting the tale of the joy that shall yet be seen within its walls: "Who is left among you that saw this house in her first glory? and how see ye it now? is it not in your eyes as nothing? Yet now be strong, O Zerubbabel, saith the Lord; and be strong, O Joshua, son of Josedech the high priest; and be strong, all ye people of the land, saith the Lord, and work. . . . For thus saith the Lord of hosts: Yet a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land; and I will shake all nations, and the noblest of all nations shall come: and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts. The glory of this latter house shall be greater than that of the former, saith the Lord of hosts: and in this place will I give peace."[5] Zephaniah even speaks of a sacrifice which the Lord has prepared for the day of His grace: "The day of the Lord is at hand: for the Lord hath prepared a festal offering, He hath bid his guests."[6]

It was also part of the prophetic teaching to intensify that

[1] Mic. vi. 6-8. [2] Jer. iv. 4. [3] Zeph. ii. 9-11.
[4] Joel iii. 20, 21. [5] Hag. ii. 3-9. [6] Zeph. i. 7.

ray of divine light which had first rendered visible to man the distant image of a Redeemer. From the earliest history of the race, it had been the task of isolated prophecies to fill up by firmer and minuter strokes the general outline of the paradisaic Protevangelium. Indeed, forestalling somewhat for the sake of convenience the contents of this present chapter, we have already seen that primeval promise limiting itself to the descendants of Shem, Abraham, Jacob, and Judah; we have heard the heathen Balaam telling of a great King, in whom the kingdom of Judah should find its full and final realization, and the meek Moses of a greater Prophet than himself, who should be the mediator of better promises; and in the Psalms we have discovered forecasts of a regal Messiah. This teaching of the Pentateuch and the Psalms was expanded by later prophets, who, in accordance with their characteristic habit of unfolding the typical aspects of things, announced their eager expectation of a noble Scion of David's royal line, a world-wide Ruler and a world-wide blessing. For the present we restrict ourselves to the Messianic testimonies of prophets prior to Isaiah. A Hosea tells how "the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a blood sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod and teraphim;" but "afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and David their King, and shall fear the Lord and His goodness in the end of the days."[1] A Joel, after his announcements of heavy impending judgments and his call to repentance, tells of a divine mercy which shall consist, first, in the coming of a Teacher of righteousness, and next, in the abundant descent of the Spirit: "Be glad, then, ye children of Zion, and rejoice in the Lord your God: for He giveth you the Teacher of righteousness; and then He poureth down upon you rain, the former rain, and the latter rain for the first time. . . . And it shall come to pass afterward, I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh."[2] An Amos, after unfolding the doings of the divine displeasure upon the chosen people, adds: "In that day will I raise up the Tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up its breaches and raise up its ruins, and I will build it as the days of eternity:

[1] Hos. iii. 4, 5. [2] Joel ii. 23, 28.

that they may possess the remnant of Edom and of all the heathen, upon whom My name is called, saith the Lord that doeth this."[1] And a Micah, after giving circumstantial predictions of the woes about to descend upon Samaria and Judah, tells how the sun shall break through the storm, the dominion return to the house of David, and an eternal King be born in Bethlehem: "And thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, too little to be among the districts of Judah, out of thee shall He come forth unto her that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth are from the times of old, the days of eternity."[2]

But, as has been before said, it was one of the peculiar tasks of prophecy to gather the two intensified rays of the sacrificial and Messianic teaching of the Old Testament, which had hitherto appeared as parallel, as in a mirror, that thenceforth they might be projected upon the obedient and studious mind as one blazing beam. Prophecy was to predict the advent of One Whose regal glory should eclipse the glowing visions of a conqueror worthy of the Davidic stock, and Whose vicarious sufferings should fulfil the anticipations of the Mosaic sacrifices.

It was the eternal honour of the calm and majestic Isaiah[3] to be the first to enunciate that these two doctrines of the past were but different phases of the same truth. Isaiah lived in that critical age of the Hebrew history when the whole kingdom was dismayed by the threatened invasion of Sennacherib, and previously by the issue of the Syriaco-Ephraimitic war; and these two events became the starting-points of his prophetical announcements.[4] He was divinely commissioned to proclaim to his countrymen, who were chewing the bitter cud of their experience, that direr punishments for transgression were in store than the disasters inflicted by the iniquitous alliance of Israel and Egypt, and a more signal deliverance than when, before the breath of the angel of the Lord, eyes waxed heavy, and the "might of the Gentiles melted like

[1] Amos ix. 11, 12. [2] Mic. v. 2.

[3] The unity of the Book of Isaiah is everywhere assumed. Isaiah is not to us an anthology.

[4] Compare Drechsler, *Der Prophet Jesajas übersetzt und erklärt*, vol. i. pp. 1–35.

snow." With the much debated analysis of the prophecies of Isaiah we need not concern ourselves. Nor need we, in the study of the predictions of the future deliverance, endeavour to collate all the passages which have any reference to that event; it will be enough for our purpose to select here and there, so as to obtain the specific teaching of Isaiah upon that point. Let, however, the principle common to all prophecy be borne in mind—of progressive development. Whether it was rendered imperative by the slender assimilating power of either prophet or people, or whether it was dictated by the continuity of the divine plan, the fact is unquestionable, that the vanishing point of the prophetic perspective tends to become less remote, and the object viewed, therefore, more and more distinct. This development is visible not only in the utterances of the several prophets, but also in the several utterances of the same prophet. It need cause no surprise, therefore, that the prediction which it was the crowning fame of Isaiah to have spoken, was not revealed to him at the outset of his career, but only as the keystone, after a firm basis and laborious superstructure had been raised by previous revelations. The earliest prophecies of Isaiah attach themselves to those given by his official predecessors. In a time of deep spiritual distress, he tells of an age when the filth of Jerusalem shall be washed away, and the Lord shall more visibly lead those who shall be saved: these things being accomplished by One, the Branch, whose very life originates in God: "In that day will the Branch of Jehovah be for honour and for glory, and the fruit of the earth for excellence and ornament to the redeemed of Israel. And it will come to pass, that he that is left in Zion, and he that is spared in Jerusalem, will be called holy, every one that is written to life in Jerusalem: when the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion, and shall have purged the blood of Jerusalem from the midst thereof by the spirit of right and the spirit of burning. And Jehovah will create over every spot of Mount Zion, and over her assemblies, a cloud and smoke by day, and the brightness of flaming fire by night: for over all the glory there shall be a covering. And a tabernacle shall be for a shadow by day from heat, and for a refuge and covert from storm and from

rain."[1] This Deliverer, the Branch of the Lord, is afterwards announced as the Son of a virgin, before whose birth the two Hebrew kingdoms shall have ceased to be monarchies: "Behold, the virgin conceives, and bears a Son, and calls His name Emmanuel."[2] Upon this announcement of the divine character and human birth of the nation's hope, there follows a noble passage in which these two elements are combined with the previous prophecies of a regal Messiah, the Son and Successor of David: "For unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given: and the government is upon His shoulders, and His name is called Wonder, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace; to the increase of government and to peace without end, upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom, to establish it and support it by justice and righteousness from henceforth and for ever."[3] Further prophecies follow, which reiterate and expand these selected features of the personal capacities, the divine and Davidic origin, and the righteous, peaceful, universal, and eternal rule of the coming Prince.[4] A new song is now heard. Thus far prophecy has been concerned with the characteristics of the King and kingdom of salvation; but nothing has been directly heard, although much has been incidentally suggested, concerning the foundation of the regal prerogative or of the subjects' rights. That there shall be a King we know: that that King shall exercise universal sway over Jews and Gentiles we also know; but how the King shall ensure the general recognition of His claims, and how the people shall obtain the peacefulness and righteousness of which we have read—these things we have not been told. To the previous features of the regal and divine Messiah, Isaiah now adds another, of the Messiah who suffers vicariously for human sin. This is the burden of what has been called the second part of the second book of the prophecy[5]—what we might justly call the second drama in the magnificent Trilogy of salvation—in which we are introduced to Him whom kings shall see and princes worship, as One, nevertheless, "Whom man

[1] Isa. iv. 2–6. [2] Isa. vii. 14–16. [3] Isa. ix. 6–8.

[4] Isa. xi., xii., xvi. 5, xviii. 7, xxv. 6–8, xxvi. 1, xxvii. 13, xxviii. 16, xxix. 18, 19, xxxii. 1–3, 17–20, xxxv., xlii. 1–9.

[5] Viz., capp. xlix.-lvii.

despiseth," "Whom the nation abhorreth," "A Servant of rulers,"[1] and Who, without rebellion, "gave His back to the smiters, His cheeks to the pluckers, and hid not His face from shame and spitting."[2] "Behold," this brilliant prophecy runs, - "Behold, my Servant will act wisely; He will rise up and be exalted, and be very high. As many were shocked at Thee: so marred was His face more than man's, and His form than the sons of men; so will He sprinkle many nations; kings will shut their mouths at Him: for they see what has not been told them, and perceive what they have not heard. Who believes our report? and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed? He grows up like a layer-shoot before Him, and as a sucker from dry ground: He hath no form nor comeliness; and we see Him, but there is no beauty that we should desire Him. He is despised and forsaken by men, a man of pains and well acquainted with disease; and like one from whom men hide their face; despised, and we regarded Him not. But He bears our diseases and pains; He takes them upon Himself; and we regard Him stricken, smitten, of God and afflicted. He is pierced for our transgressions, crushed for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace is upon Him; and by His wounds we are healed. All we like sheep go astray; we turn every one to his own way; and Jehovah makes the iniquities of us all to light upon Him. He is oppressed, and though He bows Himself, He opens not His mouth; like a sheep brought to the slaughter, and like a lamb dumb before his shearers, and He opens not His mouth. He is taken from oppression and from judgment; and His generation, who can think it out? For He is cut off out of the land of the living; for the transgression of My people the punishment came upon Him. And they gave Him His grave with the wicked, and with a rich man in His death; although He had done no wrong, neither was any deceit in His mouth. And Jehovah is pleased to bruise Him, to afflict Him with disease. When His soul hath made a trespass-offering, He will see seed, He will prolong days, and the pleasure of the Lord will prosper through His hand. Because of the travail of His soul He will see, He will be satisfied: by His knowledge, He, the Righteous One, my Servant, will justify the

[1] Isa. xlix. 6, 7.

[2] Isa. l. 5, 6.

many; and Himself will bear their iniquities. Therefore I give Him a portion in the many, and He will divide the spoil with a great company; because He has poured out His soul unto death, and allowed Himself to be numbered with the transgressors; whereas He had borne the sins of many, and made intercession for the trangressors."[1] In such words—"the golden passional of the Old Testament evangelist written, so to speak, beneath the cross upon Golgotha"—Isaiah has declared in the vicarious suffering of the Branch the secret of the Messianic sway. Many are the features of intense interest, theological and ethical, possessed by this prophecy; the one feature, however, upon which we would fix attention, is the fact that at length the dumb sacrificial types have begun to speak. We have not to do with the numerous minute features which betray the preordained connection between this prophecy and its fulfilment; nor with the distinct enunciation of the doctrine of the forgiveness of sins by a vicarious bearing of their punishment; nor with the relations so clearly portrayed between Jehovah and His Servant, and the Servant and fallen humanity: the important thing for us in the prophecy is the deliberate description of the work wrought by the Servant under sacrificial language. The soul of the Servant is called a *trespass-offering*, a fact in itself sufficiently astonishing; and not only so, but throughout the passage, as may be judged from the forms of phrase now and again cropping up, the sacrificial aspect is everywhere present. It is visible almost at the outset of the prophecy, where the technical term for the priestly act of "sprinkling," either the water of purification, or the anointing oil, or the blood of atonement, is applied to Him whose visage was marred, and whose appearance was appalling: "So will He 'sprinkle'[2]

[1] Isa. lii. 13–liii. 12.

[2] *Yazzeh*, the 3d future *hiphil* of *nazah*. Various interpretations have been adopted by commentators in order to avoid the sacrificial reference. The usage of the Old Testament having been neglected, recourse has been had to etymology, and the form in *kal* has been supposed to possess a parallel in an Arabic verb, signifying "to leap." *Yazzeh* has thus been made to mean "to cause to leap." According to this etymology, the phrase in question has been translated by different authors as follows:—Gesenius in his *Thesaurus*, who has been followed by Ewald and Beck, has: "He will cause many nations to rise and do Him

many nations." The same truth appears in the frequent expressions about "bearing our sins," "bearing our iniquities," "bearing our sorrows," "bearing our diseases."[1] And it is deserving of notice that the central truth of Mosaism—of atonement by the blood or soul—is set forth in the affirmation, "when *his soul* hath made a trespass-offering." In this prophecy concerning "the suffering Servant," in fact, the

honour." Eichhorn, Hitzig, Oehler, and Thenius render: "He will cause many to start with astonishment." Gesenius in his *Commentary*, Hendewerck, Paulus, and Winer say: "He will cause many nations to leap for joy;" and Clericus, Delitzsch, Diestel, Knobel, Maurer, Rosenmüller, and Umbreit give: "He will cause many nations to start with wonder." But, unfortunately for these several versions, they are not even plausible. The analogy of cognate dialects, ever requiring caution in application, can have no place where the usage is invariable; and the *hiphil* form of *nazah* is invariably used in the Old Testament to signify the priestly act of sprinkling. Now it is used as the technical expression for the "sprinkling" of water at the consecration of the Levites, or for the sprinkling of oil in the consecration of the Tabernacle, or for the sprinkling of blood and oil at the consecration of the priesthood (see Ex. xxix. 21; Lev. viii. 1; and Num. viii. 7). At other times it is used for the aspersion of the blood of the sin-offering, and of water in the purification of the leprous; it is also the expression used for the ceremonies of aspersion accompanying the slaughter of the red heifer, and the ritual of the Day of Atonement (see Lev. iv. 6, 17, v. 9, xiv. 7, 16, 27, 51, xvi. 14, 15, 19; Num. xix. 4, 18, 19, 21). In every case but this, which is in dispute, it is considered that the word in question signifies the priestly act of sprinkling either in the process of purification or atonement. Is it consistent to find any other meaning here? It is noteworthy that Cheyne, who formerly translated with Delitzsch and Diestel, now hesitates (*The Prophecies of Isaiah*, 3rd ed.).

[1] See Isa. liii. 4, 11, 12. In these verses the idea of "bearing" is conveyed by two verbs, viz. *sabhal* and *nasa*, the former of which has the meaning of "bearing, as a burden," and the latter of "bearing, as a punishment." *Nasa* is the much more common word, and is quite a technicality of the law. *Sabhal* only occurs nine times, and five of these are in Isaiah. From the parallel phrases in the fourth verse of this fifty-third chapter, "He bears our diseases and pains," and "He takes them upon Himself;" and from the parallel phrases in the eleventh and twelfth verses, "And He will bear their iniquities," and "He bears the sin of many," the two verbs would appear to be used here as synonymous. Now *nasa*, when connected with sins, iniquities, etc., always means the bearing their punishment, whether that be death or pain or theocratic excision, and *is of course a preliminary to sacrifice for sin* (see Lev. v. 1, 17, xvii. 16, xx. 19, xxiv. 15; Num. ix. 13, xiv. 34, xviii. 22, xxx. 16. Compare Num. xiv. 32; Job xxxiv. 31; and Ezek. xxiii. 35). According to this usage, the vicarious "bearing" of the sins of others, would be either *the bearing of the merited punishment of those sins*, or *the offering up an adequate sin-offering for them.* As a substantiation of this statement, see the singular passage, Lev. x. 17, where the vicarious bearing of sin on the part of the high priest is regarded as equivalent for the making atonement for sin.

Old Testament has made its noblest utterances, and, whilst foretelling the glorious kingdom which should be established in the end of the days, has predicted that the legal right of its Eternal Monarch will rest upon His having been at once Offerer, Priest, and Victim in the making a sufficient sacrifice for the sins of His subjects.[1] The remainder of the prophecies of Isaiah are for the most part occupied with the glories of that new kingdom which shall be founded on the attractive power of love unto death.

In the prophecies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, no advance is made upon the sacrificial teaching of Isaiah, although occasional expressions suggest acquaintance with that teaching. Thus, Jeremiah speaks of the Branch;[2] of a regal Priest who will offer eternal sacrifices;[3] and of a new covenant, when, sin being no more remembered, the divine law will be written in the inward parts.[4] Ezekiel writes of a new covenant which shall be everlasting, founded upon a perpetual forgiveness;[5] of the planting of a twig from the lofty cedar of Judaism, the growth of which will be so luxurious that fowl of every wing will dwell beneath it;[6] of a sanctifying of the divine name, and a sprinkling of water poured upon the ashes of the eternal sin-offering;[7] and of an eternal sanctuary which will be built when the Servant David is Prince for ever and ever.[8] A profitable study in this last aspect may be found in the vision of the holy waters.[9]

In the visions of Daniel, we possess just those predictions which were necessary to render the Old Testament doctrine of Sacrifice complete. As it was the honour of Moses to announce, by virtue of his prophetical office, the sacrificial cultus itself; and the honour of Isaiah to unite the two streams of prophetic teaching, and utter one comprehensive and consolatory truth of a Messiah whose glorious and world-wide kingdom should be inaugurated by an act of sacrifice: so it was the honour of Daniel to predict the exact time when that eternally signifi-

[1] See Appendix III., on the Interpretation of Isaiah liii.
[2] Jer. xxiii. 5–8, xxxiii. 13, 16.
[3] Jer. xxxiii. 17, 18.
[4] Jer. xxxi. 30–34.
[5] Ezek. xvi. 60–63.
[6] Ezek. xvii. 22–24.
[7] Ezek. xxxvi. 23–25; comp. Num. xix. 17–19.
[8] Ezek. xxxvii. 24–27.
[9] Ezek. xlvii. 1–12.

cant sacrifice should be presented. Having narrated the vision which he saw by the river of Ulai, of the ram, the he-goat, and the little horn which magnified itself against the Prince of the hosts of heaven,[1] and removed the daily sacrifice[2] (so circumstantially fulfilled when Antiochus proclaimed that his officers should "forbid burnt-offerings and sacrifice, and drink-offerings in the Temple, and that they should profane the Sabbath and festival days"[3]), Daniel next committed to writing the remarkable prediction concerning the seventy weeks. He tells how—in the first year of Darius, the sixty-ninth of the Babylonian captivity, understanding from the prophecies of Jeremiah that the desolations of Jerusalem should continue seventy years — he turned his face, about the time of the evening oblation, towards the holy city, and besought by prayer and fasting the meaning of this thing; and how, while he was yet speaking, his strong crying and tears being heard, Gabriel touched him and imparted this celebrated prophecy: "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, to seal up sins, to atone iniquity, to bring eternal righteousness, to seal up vision and prophecy, and to anoint a Holy of Holies. Know therefore and understand, from the going forth of the word to restore and build Jerusalem unto Messiah, a Prince, are seven weeks and sixty-two weeks; the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times. And after the sixty-two weeks Messiah will be cut off, and there is not to Him; and the city and the sanctuary, the people of a prince that shall come will destroy; and it will end in the flood, and to the end there is war, decree of ruins; and He will confirm the covenant with many one week, and the middle of the week will cause all the round of sacrifices to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations He shall make it desolate, even unto the consummation, and that determined shall pour down upon the desolate places."[4] Thus, in answer to Daniel's

[1] Dan. viii. [2] Dan. viii. 11. [3] 1 Macc. i. 45.

[4] Dan. ix. 24–27. In the above translation it has been the aim of the author, as in the preceding translation of the fifty-third of Isaiah, not to translate into idiomatic English, and still less to paraphrase, but to give a bare and literal rendering of the original.

prayer for deliverance, a prediction was announced to him, describing in the first place the nature, in the second the time, and in the third a chronological division of the time of deliverance. With respect to the nature of the promised deliverance, Daniel was informed that, on the one hand, it will be "a shutting in," "a sealing up," "a covering of sin;" and, on the other hand, it will be the divine initiation of eternal righteousness, the consecration of a Holy of Holies worthy of the name, and thus the placing of the seal of silence and inutility upon the provisional prophetical order. The method by which such results shall be accomplished is subsequently stated, in the chronological analysis of the seventy weeks, to be the "cutting off" of the Messiah. The time for this annulling of present disabilities and the restoration of the *régime* of Eden, is stated to be, as far as the Jews are concerned, the course of the seventieth week from the issuing of the command to restore and build Jerusalem. If, then, we can ascertain the date of this command, we shall also possess the testimony of the Old Testament as to the exact date of the abrogation of the Mosaic sacrifice and the offering up of the Messiah. That these weeks are septennia scarcely merits discussion, when once it is remembered that the prophet has been seeking the meaning of the seventy years of the desolation of Jerusalem, and has received in reply that those desolations shall extend not to seventy years, but to seventy weeks (of years, it is a matter of course). The one question, therefore, is the *terminus a quo* of these seventy septennia. Now, we read of an edict in the second year of Darius Hystaspes,[1] and also of an edict of Cyrus;[2] but neither of these can be the one in question, since they simply refer to the building of the Temple, and not "to the restoration and building of Jerusalem;" indeed, the city is still unbuilt in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah,[3] and Daniel was himself in deep affliction for his exiled fellow-countrymen two years after the edict of Cyrus.[4] There is, however, but little difference of opinion amongst those who believe in the exact chronological reference of these seventy weeks, as has been well said and insisted on by Hengstenberg:

[1] Ezra vi. 1–12.
[2] Ezra i. 1.
[3] Ezra ix. 8; Neh. i. 3, ii. 3, 5, iii. 34, iv. 1, vii. 4.
[4] Dan. x. 1–3.

"Of all the current chronological calculations in relation to this period of time, there is not a single one whose results differ more than ten years from the statements of the prophecy,"[1]—as interpreted by himself, that is to say. This difference of a decade has arisen from the fact of there having been two occasions when commands were issued of the tenor "to restore and build Jerusalem;" the first when the restoration was entrusted to Ezra, and the second when it was entrusted to Nehemiah. The question, therefore, for decision is, whether the royal letters furnished by Artaxerxes to Ezra in the seventh year of his reign,[2] or the permission granted by the same king to Nehemiah in the twentieth year of his reign, is the genuine *terminus a quo*. Now, whilst the wording of the injunction to Nehemiah is verbally more favourable to the view that the reference is to the edict granted to him, a variety of considerations, not the least important of which is the position assigned to the instructions of Ezra in the history of the time, point to the mission of Ezra as the desiderated starting-point. The credentials granted to Ezra were assuredly the most prominent command "to restore and build." The time of the great Messianic deliverance is thus stated to be the course of the seventieth septennium from the return of Ezra to Jerusalem (457 B.C.).[3]

But this period of nearly five centuries is split, in the communication of the angel, into three periods of seven, sixty-two, and a single week's duration; which three periods are again classified as a period of tribulation, lasting seven and sixty-two weeks, and a period of deliverance by the hand of Messiah lasting one week. This subdivision of "the troublous times" into an incipient stage of seven weeks may possibly be understood from the fact that the lives and labours of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Malachi extended over about half a century, and constituted a broad line of demarcation from the subsequent times when "there was no open vision." The remaining

[1] Hengstenberg, *Christologie des A. T.*, translated in *Foreign Theological Library*, vol. iii. p. 223.

[2] Ezra vii. 11–26.

[3] Compare Auberlen, *Der Prophet Daniel* (*The Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation of St. John viewed in their Mutual Relations*, T. & T. Clark), pp. 109–131.

years conduct us to A.D. 26. It was in the following year, according to the prophecy, that the Messiah should commence to confirm the covenant with many, the work of confirmation continuing for one week—that is to say, till A.D. 33; whilst in the middle of the week, namely, during A.D. 30,[1] the Messiah should be cut off, and sacrifice of the Old Testament form for ever cease. By this proclamation, which was permitted to be made by Daniel, the leading features of the Old Testament doctrine of Sacrifice were completed.[2]

The prophecies of Zechariah have often been called obscure, perhaps because the key to them is not yet in the possession of the Christian Church. They are, however, sufficiently understood for our purpose; and an attentive study will be rewarded by the discovery of numerous predictions, some of which are manifestly Messianic, and some of which have been declared to be such by their singular fulfilment in history. Still, as it is foreign to our method to employ the New Testament to decipher the Old, we put the latter on one side, and take no note of such prophecies as that of the coming of the King of the Jews upon an ass,[3] the thirty pieces of silver,[4] the wounded hands,[5] and the penitential regards of the pierced One.[6] There are, notwithstanding, some predictions which aid the study of the Old Testament doctrine of Sacrifice,—expansions, for the most part, of the previous intimations of Isaiah. We read, for example, of "a fountain that shall be opened for sin and uncleanness to the house of David, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem,"[7] the streams of which shall be more potent than the holy water which contained the ashes of the red heifer; for, in the days of its sprinkling, not only the crown of the high priest should bear the motto, "Holiness to the Lord," and the sacrificial basins which contained the blood of atonement be regarded as holier than the common utensils

[1] This is, according to the best calculations, the year of our Lord's crucifixion. Compare Wieseler, *A Chronological Synopsis of the Four Gospels*, Eng. Trans. p. 353. The year 26 would thus be the year preceding the commencement of our Lord's ministry, and the year 33 the date of the martyrdom of Stephen, after which the gospel passed to the Gentiles.

[2] Appendix IV., on the Seventy Weeks of Daniel.

[3] Zech. ix. 9. [4] Zech. xi. 12, 13. [5] Zech. xiii. 6. [6] Zech. xii. 10.

[7] Zech. xiii. 1; compare Num. xix. 9–22.

of the sanctuary and the home, but the distinction itself between the sacred and the profane should be abolished, degrees of holiness should be unknown, and the bells of the horses and the commonest saucepan should bear the hierarchical motto.[1] Nor is the means of effecting this great change undiscovered. The new Temple in which Jehovah shall be truly worshipped will be built by the Branch, at once Priest and King, who in one day will remove the iniquity of the land, and repel the sneers of Satan by replacing the filthy garments of priests and people by raiment new and fair.[2]

Even the denunciatory address of Malachi is not without its gleams of atonement; for it speaks of a righteous offering[3] which will one day be possible, and assures the faulty adherents of Mosaism that "from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same" the name of God "shall be great among the heathen, and in every place incense and a pure offering shall be offered."[4] With Malachi prophecy ceased, until the Baptist startled the wastes of Judæa with his "Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

[1] Zech. xiv. 20, 21.
[2] Zech. iii. and iv. 9–15.
[3] Mal. iii. 3.
[4] Mal. i. 11.

CHAPTER IV.

OTHER THEORIES OF OLD TESTAMENT SACRIFICE REVIEWED.

"The same tendency which led Philo and Origen, Augustine and Gregory the Great, to see in the plainest statements of the Jewish history a series of mystical allegories, in our own time has as completely closed the real contents of the Bible to a large part both of religious and irreligious readers, as if it had been a collection of fables."—STANLEY, *The Jewish Church*, vol. i. preface, p. ix.

HAVING now completed our survey of the Old Testament contributions to the inquiry we have undertaken, it is advisable, before summarizing the results arrived at, and putting the finishing touches to that platform from which as from a point of vantage we shall enter upon the examination of the doctrine of the New Testament, to cast a comprehensive glance at other theories upon the same subject. The history of thought is a considerable aid to thought, and the knowledge of scriptural doctrine may be augmented and rectified by a knowledge of what others have held to be such doctrine. Indeed, as we have previously remarked, an invaluable criterion and organon of truth is overlooked by those who, whether in the study of Holy Writ or any other domain of science, neglect the accumulated treasure of fact and theory and experience stored in the garners of the past. A survey of previous opinion should be of especial value in determining the relative worth of different methods. Let it be again repeated, that the sole test of the validity of any theory at present permissible is its conformity with Scripture.

The various doctrines which have been maintained concerning Old Testament sacrifice have more or less resulted from the application of four principles. They may hence be roughly classified as the Jewish, the allegorical, the rational-

istic, and the biblico-theological. The Jewish interpreters, denying any typical import in the Old Testament dispensation, —or, more correctly, denying any typical import which has been fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth,—concentrated their gaze upon the essential and symbolic nature of the Mosaic worship, and maintained that the religion of Judaism was alone divinely ordained amongst the religions of the world, and was alone eternal. The rationalists,—including under that common name the large and diversified class of commentators who decide upon the trustworthiness of Scripture by its congruity or incongruity with certain first principles deduced from sources external to the Bible,—whilst regarding equally with the Jew the Old Testament worship as symbolic, and as stoutly denying any typical import, differed from the Jewish expositors, inasmuch as they considered that worship to be a development—under the guidance of a master mind, it might be—from the religious habitudes of the past, itself irrevocably to fade away with the times that had given it birth. The allegorical expositors, blinded by the brilliancy of the light which Christianity projected upon Him who was at once the fulfilment and abrogation of the Law, passed over the symbolic aspects of the Old Testament entirely, and found their one delight in tracing connections, sometimes fanciful enough to sound blasphemous to modern ears, between "the dim shadow" and the "glorious substance," as they respectively designated the Old and New Testaments,—"the gross body" and "the ethereal spirit." The biblical theologian knew no first axiom but the fact that the Bible deserved study, and therefore set himself, without any preconceived opinions, to ascertain the actual contents of the sacred books in the same manner as he would ascertain the contents of any other literary production. More briefly, the Jew started with the assumption that the Old Testament, the allegorist that the New Testament, was the only reliable source of divine truth; the other classes of interpreters, consciously or unconsciously adopting the postulate that both Testaments must be resorted to in forming their theological opinions, made these Testaments their special study, the biblical theologian accepting the dictates of Scripture without question (with certain exceptions to be subsequently

mentioned), the rationalist regarding the dictates of his own reason as a superior source of information to the dictates of Scripture. In many commentators, of course, now one principle, and now another, quite irreconcilable with the former, would appear to have exercised an alternating influence.

Now, of these several classes of opinions we may at once dismiss from our notice the Jewish and the rationalistic; because, the former not conceding the claims of the New Testament to be consulted in the matter, and the latter not conceding the claims of the Holy Scriptures in both Testaments to be alone consulted, they militate with the postulate assumed throughout this work. It is no part of an inquiry essentially biblical to controvert facts and arguments which can only be successfully met by facts and arguments extra-biblical. In the statement and criticism, however, from our peculiar standpoint of the allegorical and biblico-theological views, a little time may be very properly and profitably spent.

The basis of the allegorical interpretation of Mosaism has never been more clearly stated, nor its principles more consistently carried to their logical issues, than by Origen Adamantios. That remarkable man, who, for learning, for intellect, for spiritual insight, for unflagging self-sacrifice, prominent in goodness as in error, has justly been regarded one of the pillars of the Church Catholic, both ardently conceived and ardently applied the hermeneutic principles we are about to consider. In the fourth book of his treatise *De Principiis*, a manual of speculative and dogmatic theology, and the most orderly expression of his religious opinions, he thus enunciates his views upon the interpretation of the Old Testament. In support of the thesis that the Scriptures are inspired, "written not by human art or mortal communication, but (if the phrase may be allowed) with the rhetoric of Deity," he has just adduced, in what some have termed the first chapter of that book, the arguments to be derived from the speedy and universal adoption of the Scriptures, and from the numerous cases of fulfilled prophecy. He then proceeds, in what some have called the second chapter, to show that many have slid into heresy from failing to comprehend the Scriptures *in their*

spiritual sense. Jews have demanded proof, for example, that the Christian Messiah did actually eat butter and honey as Isaiah foretold, because they have overlooked this *spiritual sense;* heretics who have refused to recognise the goodness and justice of a God who is described as "repenting" and "creating evil," have also erred from ignorance of the *spiritual sense.* This *spiritual sense* is Origen's great panacea for all apparent discrepancies in the sacred records, the infallible harmonizer of all seeming contradictions. "If any one," he explains, "should object to me concerning the immorality of Lot's daughters, or the bigamy of Abraham, or the two sisters who married Jacob, and the two handmaids who bore him sons, what other answer could I give than this, that these things are mysteries not commonly understood by us?[1] And when I read about the erection of the Tabernacle, I hold it for certain that these descriptions are figures of hidden facts, very difficult, it may be, if not impossible, to unveil and disclose. And all that descriptive narrative of the Old Testament which apparently refers to nuptials and begetting children, and battles and other historical facts, what else can these be believed to be but images and figures of hidden and sacred things,"—"enigmas and dark sayings,"[2]—"to be understood according to their soul and spirit"? Origen concedes that there are many difficulties to be overcome in ascertaining these latent spiritual meanings; but then, as he says a little farther on: "It is not he who would fain solve the Bible by a tap of the foot who can expound it, but he who has given himself to such studies with all purity, sobriety, and vigilance, in the hope that he may perchance discover the mind of the Spirit so deeply hidden." If the question be asked, where this spiritual sense is to be expected, Origen is perfectly clear; his reply is, wherever we meet with statements contrary to reason or to fact:[3] "No precept of the Law can stand according

[1] Μυστήρια ὑφ' ἡμῶν μὴ νοούμενα, translated by Rufinus, "Sacramenta quædam et formas spiritualium rerum, a nobis tamen ignorari cujusmodi sint,"—"Impressions and outlines of spiritual things, not readily comprehensible by us."—Migne, *Patrologiæ Græcæ* vol. xi. pp. 359–362.

[2] Αἰνιγμάτα καὶ σκοτεινα.

[3] Τί; ἄλογος ἢ ἀδύνατος, "irrationabilia et impossibilia," *Patrologiæ Græcæ* vol. xi. pp. 383, 384.

to the letter, the reasonableness or the possibility of which cannot be granted." Thus, by the aid of the spiritual sense to which he could always have recourse when things seemed opposed to his personal view of the correctness of things, Scripture became to him, to use his favourite simile, like "a treasure hid in a field," which he alone could hope to possess who approached the subject with "that deeper and more profound spiritual understanding." Of these *spiritual senses*, the world has heard a good deal since the days of Origen.

To what results this spiritualizing of the Mosaic worship (amongst other things) led Origen, may be readily and advantageously seen by turning to his *Homilies*.[1] In the ninth homily upon the Book of the Exodus, we have his spiritual interpretation of the Tabernacle. Having called up before the eyes of his audience in a few graphic words the Holy Sanctuary as it stood in the wilderness, gleaming with bright colours and precious metals, and surrounded by the curtained enclosure of the Court, he proceeds to draw instruction from these things. The Tabernacle is the Christian Church; the uprights of the Court are the apostles, who, as the connecting rods testify, are extending their right hands to each other in mutual support, and, as the silver with which the uprights are overlaid bears witness, are winning their way by their silvery eloquence. Somewhat inconsistently with the preceding explanation, the silver of the capitals signifies Christ, the Apostolic Head, and the silver of the sockets, the prophets, the apostolic foundation; the curtains of the Court are the congregation of believers, "who hang upon the cords of faith." Casting an eye upon the materials and colouring of the sacred structure,—the Church in hieroglyphics, as he regards it,—he thus deduces the following *notæ ecclesiæ:* The word, the invisible basis and support of the whole fabric, is saving knowledge; the brass of the altar and the Court, is godly patience; the silver which shimmers here and there, is the eloquence of preaching; the gold which covers the wood and forms the glory of the altar of incense, the candlestick, and the holy ark, is faith in Jesus; virginity is the white byssus, confessorship the scarlet, charity the purple, hope the hyacinth.

[1] Migne, *Patrologiæ Græcæ* vol. xii.

It would appear, indeed, that what Origen says in so many words of the Mosaic laws of uncleanness, "that they were observed amongst the Jews in a manner sufficiently inappropriate and useless," was his deliberate opinion concerning the literal interpretation of any portion of the Law. In the homily upon the vestments of the priesthood,[1] there are some further curious results of this spiritual method: the high priest is of course the High Priest of our profession; the two tunics which the High Priest wore, were the one His carnal, and the other His spiritual ministrations; the double girdle of the priesthood and the ephod signified respectively the being girt with the virtues of the Spirit, and the being excluded from all corporeal vitiation; the breastplate betokened wisdom; the mitre, the intimate knowledge of God which Jesus possessed; the anointing oil poured out in the ceremony of consecration, was the oil of gladness He had above His fellows; the injunctions of the high priest never to touch the dead, expressed materially his separateness from sinners; and, not to enter upon the lengthy and curious exposition of the characteristics of the high priest's wife, most singularly of all the convocation of the people by Moses to witness the solemn investiture of Aaron and his sons, was the assembling of "all the virtues of the soul," that "whilst talk is held about the priestly sacraments, all the virtues may be wakeful and intent that nothing of wisdom or knowledge or industry may be absent, but the whole multitude of senses arrayed to comprehend the significance of the high priest and anointing and investiture." In a similar manner the Levitical laws of sacrifice are expounded.[2] Having fervently ejaculated the beatitudes: "Blessed are the eyes that see the Divine Spirit hidden beneath the veil of the letter," and, "Blessed are they who bring the clean ears of the inner man to hear these things," he proceeds to state his opinion that it is folly to think that the Law would prescribe different sacrifices for different persons,—one for a man, another for a high priest, and another for a ruler: by a man the human race must be meant; by a spotless calf, the fatted calf which the Father slew for the returning prodigal;

[1] *In Leviticum*, Homilia vi. [2] *Ibid.* Homilia i.

by a young bullock from the herd, a descendant of the Patriarchs; by a spotless male animal, one who is not defiled with women; by the sons of Aaron who are to pour out the blood of the sacrifice, none others, he thinks, can be intended than Annas and Caiaphas; and, not to multiply examples, the command that the sacrifice be slain at the door of the Tabernacle refers to the fact that it must be slain not *within* but *without* the door,—that is to say, "without the gate." The ritual of sacrifice comes in for its share of a like treatment: the priest who removes the skin of the victim removes the veil of the letter, and reveals the inner spiritual meaning; to divide the members, is to rightly divide the word of truth; to place the several pieces upon the hearth, is to implant the truth in hearts which are the altar of God, and wherein the divine fire is ever burning; then, strangely enough, he is said to place wood in order for the sacrifice who mingles in his speech the divine and human attributes of Christ! Again, speaking a little further on of the various offerings which might be presented under the Law, Origen explains these numerous details by saying that a calf was brought by him who conquered carnal pride, a bullock by him who kept under irrational emotions, a goat by him who overcame lasciviousness; he gave a pair of doves who allied his mind in holy meditation with the word of God; his was an offering of bread who gave himself unreservedly to his Maker in whatever position of life he had been placed, whether he were a farm-labourer, a sailor, or what not; whilst those sacrifices were mingled with oil and incense which were accompanied by penitence and meekness. When the priest is bidden sprinkle blood seven times before the Lord, what is that, Origen asks, but to designate by a mystery the sevenfold grace of the Spirit which he should display?[1] So, in his esteem, the four horns of the altar of burnt-offering are the four gospels.[2] But we refrain from further illustration. Surely it is such *spiritual senses*, and not the literal acceptance of words, which have tended, as Origen alleges, "to the subversion and hindrance of the Christian Church!"[3] Surely it is better to believe that "the omnipotent God is made

[1] *In Leviticum*, Homilia iii. [2] *Ibid.* Homilia iii. [3] *Ibid.* Homilia v.

propitious by frying some things in a pan, and baking others in an oven, and broiling others on a gridiron," as he sarcastically summarizes the perfectly intelligible and reasonable injunctions for the meat-offering, than that it is He who has given to Christianity this gift of spiritual understanding!

This allegorizing tendency which Origen, logically as we believe, carried to such conclusions, has been displayed more or less by the larger majority of expositors in all ages of the Christian Church; and not only has the tendency been prevalent, but, until the recent awakening of the historic sense in relation to biblical hermeneutics, it might be termed all-prevailing. It tinged the arguments of the Apostolic Fathers in their controversy with Judaism; it was the ruling principle of the later Fathers in the East and in the West; not even the cold intellectualism of Scholasticism eliminated it, for it was adopted and elaborated, albeit in more temperate forms, by men like Isidor of Hispala, the venerable Bede, Hugo St. Victor, and Abelard; it flourished when the Reformation prompted an increased study of the Holy Bible, as the extant writings of Calvin, Melanethon, and Zwingli abundantly testify; and to-day it irresistibly crops up in the familiar *spiritualizing* of popular preachers and unscientific expositors, for whom "to find Christ everywhere in the Bible," in their own shallow and materialistic sense, is more attractive than truth. But for occasional gleams of a deeper intelligence in men like the author of the *Clementine Recognitions*, Alcuin and Bonaventura, the whole history of the study of Mosaism until quite recent times would have been a history of research under false lights and with distorted vision.

The origin of the allegorical method is intelligible enough. Allegorizing arises from a misapprehension of the relation which the Old Testament bears to the New. Christ being the Way, the Truth, and the Life, He must always have been so, it is argued; and therefore, without looking for any deeper sense in which the Eternal Word is revealed in the Old Testament, without appreciating the astounding anticipation of "the times of the end" which is thus effected, without even a faint apprehension either of the insuperable difficulty or the ridiculous nullity of the task thus attributed to the

Jew, the allegorist at once concludes that every feature of the New Testament revelation was minutely and exactly given in the material representations of the Old. The Law was a hieroglyphic Gospel, it is assumed. Instead of recognising the enormous importance of the distinction between the utility of types *before* and *after* the appearance of their antitypes (to which we have already given some attention, and shall give more), the order of things has been reversed, the New Testament facts having been treated as types, and the Old Testament figures as antitypes. Dim prophetic evidence has been regarded as prophecy as clear as its fulfilment. A system of worship essentially educational and suggestive has been designated pædagogic, it is true; but the pædagogue was as fully instructed as the master to whom his tuition was preparatory. To interpret any difficult allusion in the details of the Mosaic law, an allegorist simply watches for some corresponding feature in the Christian dispensation, being guided in his search sometimes by express statements, and sometimes by fancied analogy; and then, having ascertained all the *minutiæ* of the antitype he imagines he has discovered, he further sets his imagination to work to find resemblances to these same *minutiæ*. He is in search, perhaps, of the meaning of the Jewish Passover in all its details; he does not ask himself what the Jew could have seen in that institution by the light of the Law; he does not inquire what he himself can see to be harmonious in that festival with the beliefs of those early and uninstructed times: no, he finds in St. Paul's Epistles the phrase, "Christ our Passover," and without looking any further for the significance of the apostolic words, without seeking for a *fundamentum analogiæ* which underlies both Jewish festival and Christian fulfilment, perhaps passing a hard judgment upon the stubbornness of the Jew who so materially interpreted the feast, the allegorist contents himself with saying that the Passover was a type of Christ. Well and good if he stayed there; he would have missed the symbolic aspect of the subject altogether, but he would have attained the typical. The evil is that he does not stay there, but, from his knowledge of the details of the offering of Christ, he dogmatically

asserts that all the details of the Passover are now explained; a typical symbolism he converts into a symbolism of the antitype; the lamb is Christ, its age is this attribute of Jesus, the roasting is that feature of His sufferings, the leaven and the tearing limb from limb in the process of eating, each refer to some element in the believer's appropriation of Christ. Or possibly the New Testament contains no express allusion to some fact in the Old; then any resemblance, however remote or imaginative, may suffice to constitute preordained connection: to tell the tale of Joseph, envied by his brethren, becomes the pre-Christian method of speaking of Christ and Pilate; the sale of Joseph for twenty pieces of silver foretells the treachery of Judas; Joseph's entrance upon life at the age of thirty, spoke of Him who should enter upon a wider sphere than carpentry at Nazareth at the same age, etc. Is it not time that this fanciful and mechanical method of studying the divine revelation was at an end? Whatever value it may be supposed to have in practical application from the pulpit, should not the exponent of Scripture be on his guard against any use of the sacred volume which sacrifices truth to fix attention, and advances morals by bringing the Bible itself into ridicule? That there is a deep-lying and pre-ordained system of type and antitype, the author knows so well that he is anxious lest that system be forgotten in parodies. He has already penned one chapter upon the typical aspect of Mosaism, and will pen others in his second book; but he would caution the reader against the exaltation of the typical aspect of the Bible by a concentration of the imagination upon the antitype, to the exclusion of a patient and intelligent study of the symbolism of the type.

In characterizing the faults of allegorizing as a method for the interpretation of Scripture, it may be said, in the first place, that the allegorical method—we use this name not at all as a stigma, but simply for convenience—errs by a failure to grasp the importance of the lapse of time between each divine revelation. Allegorizing is unhistorical. There is a deep intention in the progressive knowledge of his relations to the eternal world imparted by God to man. The Patriarchal Age, Judaism in its various forms, and Christianity, have each

had a distinct and definite purpose in universal history; and we may be assured that if Christianity pure and simple could have been taught at Sinai, divine proclamations would not have been made from the cloud upon the Mount, or from the shechinah in the Tabernacle. If there was "a fulness of time," there must also have been "an incompleteness of time." If there was a speaking by the Son, the effulgence of the divine glory, and the impress of the Divine Person, there was also a speaking πολυτρόπως καὶ πολυμερῶς, "by various methods and in several sections." To ignore, therefore, or confuse this development in the divine revelations, is to neglect the will and wisdom of the omniscient and omnipotent God. The true doctrine of types realizes that in each of these successive manifestations from on high there are preordained resemblances; but preordained coincidences are not, as the allegorist practically asserts, preordained and possibly pre-recognised identities.

The allegorical method also errs, in the second place, by constituting ingenuity a test of truth. According to its conception, there are perfect clearness and precise limits in the New Testament antitypes, whereas the types were expressly constructed to foreshadow in unlabelled details the features of the antitype. Wherever the imagination, therefore, could discover the faintest analogy, it was assumed that there was a pre-established connection. Was it wonderful that the method prompted excesses? Uncertainty and caprice were of its very nature. So long as the interpretations given to the Levitical institutions, for example, limited themselves to those things which are expressly stated to be their counterparts in the New Testament, as in the cases of the Passover, the Sin-offering, and the Tabernacle, a boundary flexible enough in all conscience was placed to homiletical extravagance; but when these New Testament statements were exceeded, and the whole cultus in its minutest detail was regarded as "full of Christ," licence knew no bounds, and the most fanciful interpretations were calmly propounded and enthusiastically listened to. Thus, instead of there being one consistent view of a given sacrificial institution, there were hundreds arrogating to be scriptural; one expositor advanced one opinion, and one another, until the whole conception of Mosaism became dim

and unreal in the extreme. Indeed, it is the allegorical method which is largely responsible for the common opinion, previously referred to, that "the Bible can be made to mean anything."

Thirdly, the allegorical method erred most egregiously by ignoring the express statements of the Pentateuch. In adhering to Scripture, as it imagined, it falsified the very testimony of Scripture. The Pentateuch deliberately propounded the significance of the leading features of its institutions; this revealed significance was smothered beneath quite another, which these institutions were supposed to present. It is unnecessary to repeat the lengthy illustration of this point already given; we simply refer the reader to the contents of the chapter upon the essential significance of the Mosaic injunctions. Mosaism, as truly as Christianity, by its own declaration, was a religion *per se*, and this fact the method in question absolutely missed.

But a yet more weighty charge may be brought against this method, in the fourth place,—viz., that the one element of truth which it was the honour of the allegorists to have brought into prominence, was so vitiated and neutralized by erroneous inferences as to be practically valueless. At least the allegorical method, it may be contended, drew attention to the typical nature of the Old Testament. It did, indeed, but in so questionable a way that it would have been very amazing if Trypho had deserted Judaism for the arguments of Justin. It will long ago have occurred to the reader that the first essential to a convincing study of the typology of Scripture must be a study of Scripture symbolism; this preliminary study was unknown to the allegorists, and only occasionally entered upon by unconscious instinct. To possess any truthful knowledge of scriptural types and antitypes, a knowledge of the types must at any rate be the first step; the allegorist changed the order of things, and made the study of the antitype his first step, with this result, that although for eighteen centuries the attention of the Church Catholic has been turned to the study of the typology of Mosaism, that study has to be practically recommenced to-day, without any aid from the past beyond the impregnable assurance of the futility of previous methods. A Columbus must sail

unknown seas to reach a new world; the new world in theology has been discovered by sailing the same seas by the aid of new methods.

The allegorizing method first fell into permanent disrepute at the close of the seventeenth century. When all Europe was disturbed by religious convulsions,—when Rome was struggling with Jansenism, the Lutheran Church with the pietistic movements which gave birth to the Moravian Brotherhood, Holland and the other countries where the Reformed Church was dominant with a great reaction against its Calvinistic creeds,—it was no wonder that England became the scene of many a theological and ecclesiastical trouble; it was subject for congratulation, however, that the intellectual movements which inaugurated the "seculum rationalisticum"[1] and the reign of Deism, discouraged at any rate the popular *spiritual* interpretation of Mosaism. The "common sense" of Locke and Bacon gave no countenance to the "spiritual sense" of Origen and his followers, and in the steady advance of the scientific spirit, upholders of revealed truth were compelled to show cause for their convictions by an analysis of Scripture from quite other standpoints. Several works were the result, which, while they threw discredit upon the allegorical methods, also made some permanent additions to biblical study. A brief glance at the principal of these will form a fitting transition to the biblico-theological view of Mosaism.

A powerful and learned work upon the Hebrew ritual,[2] written with classic elegance and rhetorical fulness, and teeming with patristic and rabbinic quotations, by John Spencer, the Principal of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and Prebendary of Ely, fell in with the current theological taste, and largely aided the temporary downfall of "typical" extravagance. The question Dr. Spencer set himself to

[1] *Essays and Reviews*, "Tendencies of Religious Thought in England."

[2] The first edition was published at Cambridge in 1685, under the title, *De Legibus Hebræorum Ritualibus et earum Rationibus, libri tres*. A reprint was issued at the Hague in 1686, and another at Leipsig in 1705. A posthumous edition, containing a fourth book (of replies to the numerous controversial works to which the book had given rise), was published at Cambridge in 1727. A German impression, with a preliminary dissertation by C. M. Pfaff, was issued at Tübingen, 1732.

answer was, Why the Hebrew ritual had been given by God at all? what was the purpose (or purposes) which prompted its revelation? Before his time the reply customarily returned had been, To represent to the Jews by figure what the gospel reveals to the Christian Church by fact. For such a reply Dr. Spencer had little esteem. "For who," he asks, "that has a little ounce of brain, can persuade himself that God has appointed so many and manifold rites in order to represent the few and simple mysteries of Christianity? or has wished to use those shadows and figures for foreshadowing the gospel facts, which are so obscure and uncertain in meaning, that no one has been skilled enough hitherto to unseal their mystical senses by any sure method? What mystery underlaid that precept about throwing the intestines and feathers of birds away only on the east side of the altar? What mystery was intended by the fact that eucharistic offerings were to be accompanied by unleavened bread? that the hair of the Nazarite should be burnt beneath the caldron in which the sacrificial flesh was cooked? that a red cow should be slaughtered by way of expiation? and, not to speak of many other things, that at the Feast of Tabernacles thirteen bulls should be slain, on the second day twelve, on the third eleven, and so on down to seven, which were to be presented on the last day? These and many other institutes of the Law do not present the least shadow of a more secret meaning, or of anything mysterious to be wrung from them even by torture. I know that the genius of an alchemist can extract something spiritual from the most arid rite, and turn the tiniest detail of the Law into a sacrament; but we should be very cautious, when endeavouring to lay bare the inner senses of the Law, that we are not mistaken, and take a cloud to our bosom instead of Juno, a figment of our own brains instead of a divine mystery." Rebuking those who "find material for philosophizing in the poles, rings, and dimensions of the ark," and "obscure the letter of the Law by expositions some centuries too early," Dr. Spencer advances seven reasons for distrusting their allegorical interpretations:[1] First, it is due to this mistaken method that the purpose and reason of so many Mosaic injunc-

[1] Book I. cap. xi. § 5.

tions have, in spite of the exertions of centuries of investigators, hitherto remained unknown. Secondly, this method throws the door wide open to follies of all kinds, and, under the pretence of unsealing divine mysteries, gives opportunities for "blabbing out any exegetical nonsense." Thirdly, this method of allegorizing often causes no little trouble to good Christian people, who become anxious that they are not adepts in betaking themselves to the "glorious study of types," and that they have nothing to draw with from this well of living water, "and the well is deep." Fourthly, allegory has obscured the divine wisdom and goodness as displayed in the Mosaic laws, not rarely substituting for prescience of the highest kind "a futile and twisted mystery colder than the ice of the Apennines." Fifthly, this freedom in allegorizing has been adopted from men of but little note, and we ought surely to pause before interpreting Scripture according to the methods of heathen theologians, Platonists, and Jews. Sixthly, such a method must result in numerous utterly discordant interpretations of the very same rite. And lastly, the belief that the Mosaic laws were mere enigmas and mysteries couched in simple language, has in every age brought the literal meaning of these laws into contempt, and robbed them of any authority they might have had with the common people. Dr. Spencer returned a reply to his main question very different to these "allegorical vapours" concerning the purposes of the Mosaic injunctions.

Having stated in his preface that it was his intention, by all means within his power, scriptural, historical, and patristic, to restore to remembrance the reasons and origin of the Mosaic laws, which had become lost through the lapse of time and the mental dulness and superstition of their custodians the Jews, and having pointed out in his prolegomena that there must have been a divine purpose in the institution of those laws which we are at liberty to investigate, Dr. Spencer proceeds in his first book to state and support by argument what he conceives that purpose to be. Confessing frankly that he is unable to resolve every detail of the Law, he considers it sufficient, he remarks, "legum earum *omnium* causas generales et *præcipuarum* causas speciales in apricum proferre,"—"to bring to light the general causes *of all* the laws, and the

special causes of the *most prominent*." Dr. Spencer regards the Mosaic laws and rites to have been instituted for two reasons chiefly, a *primary* and a *secondary*.[1] The *primary* motive was to cure the Israelites of the idolatry to which they were so prone; the *secondary* motive was to image, so to speak, certain moral and evangelical duties. Of this latter representative purpose of the Sinaitic injunctions Spencer does not treat at length. That the Mosaic ritual did serve "to adumbrate mysteries," he considered proved by the testimony of Jews, Christians, and Scripture; but what these mysteries were which were thus foreshadowed, he describes in the briefest possible manner.[2] Some of the Mosaic institutions were, he thought, images of things in heaven, as Josephus and the Book of Wisdom taught; some, as Philo imagined, expressed certain secrets of philosophy; some of the laws were prophecies of evangelical truths,—the moral law exhibiting, for example, those virtues which the New Testament morality brought into clearer light, and the ceremonial law predicting some of the great facts of the gospel. It would also appear, he imagines, that some features of the law symbolized certain common facts of ethics, and certain common events of history. But it was upon what he called the *primary* aim of Mosaism that Spencer concentrated his strength, thereby making a permanent contribution to the study of Judaism. That the rites ordained at Sinai had their *raison d'être* in the necessary conflict with the idolatrous tendencies of the Jews, is the keynote of the entire work. "Since the hard service and very indifferent manners of Egypt had obliterated almost all traces of God and His worship, and the Jews, from their long communication with the Egyptians, had almost wholly degenerated to their habits and inclinations, God determined to recall them to religion and the primitive state from which they had miserably fallen, but not immediately, nor by straight lines, so to speak. The Israelites were so perverse, that they could be brought back to their religion as well as to their fatherland *circuitously* only. Accustomed to sacrifices, expiations, purifications, and religious acts of that nature, they could not be led back to

[1] Book I. cap. i. [2] Book I. cap. xi. especially § 3.

the worship of the true God unless God tolerated in His worship those same rites, and other similar ones, by the use of which their minds had been overcome, and amended and adapted them to a more sacred use." [1]

This *primary* purpose of the Mosaic rites, which he only treats of generally in his first book, he discusses more specifically in the second and third,—in the former of which he argues that the seductive effects of idolatry were neutralized by *deliberate prohibitions* of certain idolatrous doctrines and customs; and in the latter, that the same result was produced by a *deliberate toleration* of other idolatrous practices in themselves harmless or useful. As illustrations of this counteraction by interdict, he instances, with laborious minuteness and detail, the ceremony of the Passover, the construction of the altar of burnt-offering, and such inhibitions as that honey should not be given in sacrifice nor the price of unchastity, that blood should not be eaten, that children should not be passed through the fire to Moloch, that the flesh should not be cut or the head shaven in divine service, and that worship should take place in groves: all of which injunctions were directly opposed to heathen customs. As illustrations of this counteraction by tolerance, he cites the opinion of Chrysostom [2] that the sacrifices of the Jews, their purifications, their new moons, the ark, and the Temple itself, had their origin in the crudeness of profane nations, and undertakes to fortify it by eight examples: the Tabernacle, the horns of the altar, the linen vestments of the priesthood, the hair of the Nazarite, the sacrificial feasting, the feasts generally, the offering of first-fruits, and the offering of tithes, in each of which he believes that there are instances of the adoption by Moses of heathenish rites. He subsequently applies the same hypothesis to explain other features of the Sinaitic ceremonial.

[1] Book III. Dissert. ii. preface.

[2] "Ne opineris Deo indignum esse, quod Magi per stellam vocentur. Ita enim Judæorum omnia, sacrificia, purgationes, neomenias, arcum, templumque ipsum, reprobabis; siquidem hæc omnia a Gentium profanarum ruditate originem habuerunt. Deus enim ad errantium salutem, per hæc quidem se coli passus est, per quæ gentes extraneæ Dæmonas coluerunt; ea tamen aliquantum in melius inflectent, ut eos paulatim a consuetudine revocatos, ad altiorem perduceret sapientiam."

Thus, the Tabernacle is an adaptation of the tabernacle of Moloch; the vestments of the priesthood are imitations of the attire of the priests of Ammon, Isis and Osiris; the horns of the altar were the Phœnician symbols of excellence and strength. It is unnecessary for us to follow Dr. Spencer in his elaborate examination of the Mosaic rites, *nominaliter*, *materialiter*, *modaliter*, *formaliter*, *finaliter*, in each of which he believes that he finds proof of his thesis. The preceding outline of his argument will suffice.

As an example of Spencer's method, no better instance can be selected than his interpretation of the rationale of the Passover.[1] Spencer does not deny that the circumstances of the Paschal celebration had reference to the great Antitype who is "Our Passover;" but such reference is simply a secondary effect of the promulgation of the law, a proof of the wisdom and foresight of its great Originator: "By the wisdom of the Highest Lawgiver, the Paschal Feast, than which the Hebrew cultus had nothing more distinguished, was ordered to be observed with various ceremonies, in order that it might refer to times past, times present, and times future." The primary aim of the Passover was the overthrow of idolatry; and this effect was produced in two ways, by tolerating some features and prohibiting others of the Sabæan worship. Thus the general idea of a religious feast, in which a whole family might share, was an express importation from the religions of heathendom. To admit, therefore, such a feast into the religion of Jehovah, was to fight idolatry with its own weapons. On the other hand, numerous details of the Passover celebration waged war to the knife with the rites of Egypt, by determined opposition and express disallowance. Upon the proof of this latter point Spencer bends his strength, and exhibits at once the strength and weakness of his theory. He treats of this overthrow of idolatry by prohibition in five sections. In the first he desires to throw light upon the command: "In the tenth day of this month, they shall take to them a lamb, according to the house of their fathers . . . a male of the first year." This command had its origin, he thinks, in the ram-worship of the Egyptians: "To treat this sacred animal with

[1] See *inter alia*, Book II. cap. iv. §§ 1-4.

such contumely, by slaying it and sprinkling its blood upon the door-posts, would effectually prevent a return to the Egyptian custom." In his second section, he finds in the fact that none of the Passover was to be eaten raw, a further substantiation of his theme: such a command would prevent those Bacchic rites which, according to Homer, Euripides, and Plutarch, were so common amongst the Greeks and Romans, where raw flesh and blood were freely partaken of; rites too, which, according to Herodotus and others, were directly introduced into Greece from Egypt. Further, in the face of the indisputable evidence that the Sabæans boiled their sacrifices, he imagines that he obtains additional testimony to his view in the roasting of the paschal lamb. The fourth section supplies an additional argument from the roasting of the lamb entire: to prepare the meal thus was to effectually prevent recourse to the examination of the viscera in augury, a practice extremely common amongst the ancient Orientals.

The ingenuity, labour, and learning which Spencer brought to his task were unbounded; the result has demonstrated the futility of his hypothesis. His great work, influential in its own day for its consistent opposition to the allegorical tendency, remains to-day a storehouse of facts for the comparative study of religion; his theory finds no serious supporter. Yet the prominent theory of his book is not unmixed error. Indeed, there is so large an element of truth in what he has maintained so vigorously and so fully, that he has laid all students of the Mosaic laws under permanent obligations. He assuredly recognised the symbolic and typical aspect of the Sinaitic injunctions; but at the same time he pushed his leading hypothesis to such results as to invalidate, and indeed annihilate, his recognition. True it is, as was said by Archbishop Magee, Spencer's work "has always been resorted to by infidel writers to wing their shafts more effectively against the Mosaic revelation." The fault of Spencer was the urging a true conclusion to unwarrantable and false issues. His fundamental error was the regarding the representative nature of Mosaism as but a secondary feature. Nevertheless, it must not be forgotten that what Spencer represented as the primary cause of the Mosaic revelation was undoubtedly a secondary effect.

Another important work,[1] that of Outram, or Owtram, the learned Canon of Westminster, which was published a few years before that of Spencer, was dictated by the exigencies of the Evangelical controversy with Socinianism. Socinus and his followers had denied that there was any reference whatever, either in the Old Testament sacrifices or in the New Testament statements, to a doctrine of vicarious sacrifice, and Outram undertook an inquiry with the express purpose of refuting these assertions. "While I was reflecting on these things, it occurred to me that the Scriptures speak of Christ as our High Priest, and of His death not only as the death of a martyr and witness, but also as that of an expiatory victim slain for the sins of mankind; that the high priest shadowed forth Jesus Christ our High Priest, and their expiatory victims, to say nothing here of the others, represented Christ as our Victim; and, lastly, that it is beyond all doubt that what was shadowed forth by the types was really accomplished by the Antitype. Being fully persuaded of this sentiment, I thought it necessary to examine the sacrifices of the Jews, and carefully to inquire what is the proper design of a sacrifice; what kinds of sacrifice were appointed by the laws of Moses; which of those kinds principally shadowed forth the sacrifice of Christ; what a very particular selection of every kind was appointed by God; to what persons each kind was either enjoined or permitted; on what accounts, with what ceremonies, and in what place, it was to be offered and killed; what was the design of the sacred Tabernacle, of the Temple at Jerusalem, of the consecrated altar, and of the sacred table; what were the respective parts of the priests, the Levites, and the offerers in regard to the sacrifices; and, lastly, what opinions were held by the Jewish doctors and by the heathen on their respective sacrifices, and by the ancient Christian writers on both."[2] In the carrying out of this plan, Dr. Outram made some valuable additions to the theory of scriptural sacrifice. He divided his work into two parts, the former of which was a dissertation upon all the sacrifices

[1] *De Sacrificiis*, published 1677. A translation by John Allen, slightly abridged from the larger work, was published in 1817.

[2] Eng. Trans. pp. 4, 5.

of the Jews, with scattered remarks upon heathen sacrificing, and the latter a dissertation upon the sacrifice of Christ. It is with the first dissertation that we are especially concerned. After a statement of the two opposing views concerning the origin of Sacrifice, which he does not venture to reconcile or decide, and a preliminary investigation of the divine design in enjoining the rite of sacrificing in any form, he proceeds to discuss the entire Jewish ritual, treating in the first instance of the places appropriated to sacrifice; in the second, of the ministers of sacrifice; and, lastly, of the sacrifices themselves and their rites. Under each of these divisions Dr. Outram examines the testimony of Scripture and of the Rabbis. With regard to the places used for sacrifice, he summarizes the testimony concerning the places themselves,—the sanctuaries, courts, altars, rooms, and other parts,—and concerning their nature and design. Under the head of the sacrificial ministrants, he classifies the various injunctions of the Pentateuch and the Jewish commentators upon the priests, their duties, their consecration, the integrity of their life, their bodily perfection, their family purity, and upon the Levites. Then follow the details from the same sources concerning the meat-offerings, the selection of victims, the burnt-offerings, the peace-offerings, the trespass-offerings, the public sacrifices, such features of the ritual employed as the presentation and waving, the imposition of the hand and the accompanying prayers, the slaughter, the sprinkling of the blood, the flaying, the burning of some portions, and the feasting upon others. In fact, Dr. Outram passes most completely through the entire range of injunctions as to the places, ministrants, and varieties of sacrifice.

This book of Outram's was a very valuable contribution to the study of Old Testament sacrifice, and it is matter for regret that he only submitted this great and important subject to review in order to meet the requirements of a temporary controversy. Had he betaken himself to examine the Mosaic sacrifices as a whole, and apart from any more immediate motive, there is reason to believe that he might have rendered much recent research unnecessary. To his classification of the various injunctions little needs be added, except to bring

into greater prominence the purifications and the sacrificial times and seasons; and with respect to the treatment of the injunctions themselves, his only fault was the too ready assumption of the identity of the worship of the Mosaic Age and that of the Age of Christ and His apostles. Outram also appears to have clearly apprehended the essential, symbolical, sacramental, and typical import of the Mosaic injunctions, although he has nowhere elaborated either. As it is, however, this work is a remarkable production, and is of considerable value to-day from its accumulation of facts and quotations relative to the subject in hand, extracted from rabbinical and patristic writers.

In proof of the much more healthy tone which was being infused into the study of the Old Testament, under the influence of the revived attention which was paid at the close of the seventeenth and the commencement of the eighteenth centuries to the classic works of the early Christian and later Jewish writers, and under the influence of men like Spencer, Outram, Lightfoot, Lowth, Patrick, and Warburton, a less known but more important work[1] (which has been frequently quoted in the preceding pages), by the author of the famous *Argument to prove the Existence of God*, may be cited. "Being very sensible," Lowman says in his advertisement to the reader, "fancy and imagination, how pretty, how ingenious soever, are neither reasons nor arguments, therefore are not to be given or taken as such," he has set himself to lay before his readers "a full plan of the Jewish ritual," in order that "the true reasons and uses of the whole might appear in the harmony of all the several parts, centring in one view," and so "to promote virtue and true religion;" for "if ever we hope to attain a knowledge of the true reasons of things, it must be by considering things as they are, not as they are not, in what manner soever we may imagine they ought to have been." Having then decided, *a priori*, from a consideration of the state of the world and of the Hebrew nation when the Law was given by Moses, that the characteristics of a wise

[1] Moses Lowman, *A Rational of the Ritual of the Hebrew Worship, in which the Wise Designs and Usefulness of that Ritual are explained, and vindicated from Objections*, 1748.

revelation would be, first, that it should "answer the true ends of religion, in a manner best suited to these circumstances of the world and the covenant of God with Abraham and his seed as His Church;" secondly, that it should "preserve this Church from idolatry by a sufficient provision against the great and many dangers of falling into it;" and, thirdly, that it should "answer both these ends by such ritual constitution as should teach such moral instruction, and such principles of religious reverence and obedience as should promote the great ends of all true religion," and "prepare the way for that better state of the Church to come," he proceeds to show how the Mosaic ritual conformed to this ideal excellence. To this end he first passes the entire ritual—the ritual of the shechinah, of the ministry of the shechinah, and of the worship of the shechinah, as he classifies the entire ceremonial—under review, and then directs attention to the wisdom and reasonableness of the whole. His entire discussion is most able. In evidence of the first end of a wise revelation to promote the essentials of true religion, he quotes the opinion of Lord Herbert of Cherbury, that the essentials of true religion are, first, that there is a supreme God; secondly, that the supreme God is to be worshipped; thirdly, that virtue is the best part of divine worship; fourthly, that men are to repent of their sins; and, fifthly, that there are rewards and punishments in this life and after it; and then turns the tables upon the Deists, by showing that the Mosaic ritual fostered just these beliefs,—the existence, unity, and providence of God, the necessity of worshipping Him, the value of repentance and obedience in divine worship, and the fact of a great moral government. Lowman further conclusively demonstrates that the Hebrew ritual was serviceable in preventing idolatry, and clinches his entire argument by showing that the whole ritual of Moses was a shadow of the good things to come, and "a sketch of that state of religion which was actually brought into the world when all the nations of the earth were blessed in the coming of the promised Messiah." In fact, although not expressly so named, Lowman's entire reasoning assumes the essential, symbolical, sacramental, and typical significance of the Mosaic injunctions. It is matter for regret that the

spread of the great evangelical movement at the close of the last century, within and without the Episcopal Church of England, caused so rational a view of the scriptural doctrine of Sacrifice to fall for a time into the background, and the temporary reinstatement in pulpit and academy of the displaced allegorical method.

The recent revival in England of an interest in the scriptural conception of Mosaism has been largely due to the indirect as well as direct influence of the biblical theologians of Germany; and, inasmuch as the present condition and future prospects of thought upon Old Testament sacrifice cannot be understood without some knowledge of the labours of these German explorers, amongst whom Dr. Bähr was pioneer, and Keil, Ewald, Kurtz, and many others have proved themselves able and judicious followers, a few words may be profitably spent in characterizing the ceremonial branch of Old Testament theology as far as that has been at present scrutinized.

It is now nearly forty years since Dr. Bähr committed his great work [1] to the press, with the prayer "that God would grant that his labours . . . might contribute somewhat to a deeper insight into biblical truth." Previous investigations had confined themselves, as we have seen, to the typical aspects of Mosaism for the most part, and had resulted in the wildest allegorizing; or, if in the intellectual unsettlement of the latter centuries the moorings to the current Calvinistic and Lutheran creeds had been slipped, biblical exposition had either regarded the Leviticus as a religious code adroitly drawn up on an eclectic principle from the rites and ceremonies witnessed by Moses in Egypt, or had maintained a silence more eloquent than speech occasionally broken to discourse coldly upon "those interesting relics of a long-buried antiquity," or the "sublime conception, in the midst of childish superstitions, of the Hebrew Deity." It has been the lot of Dr. Bähr to inaugurate a closer and more exact study of the Old Testament

[1] *Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus*, 1st vol. 1837, 2nd vol. 1839. The first volume of a second edition appeared towards the close of 1874. In this first volume the 498 pages of the first edition have become 602 pages by the addition of a critical examination of the objections of opponents.

worship, to witness this field of labour tilled by some of the greatest theologians and exegetes of his time, and to hear every co-worker, whether in the field of biblical archæology or biblical theology, gratefully acknowledge that, however much he may personally differ from the conclusions of the *Symbolism of the Mosaic Worship* in principle or detail, he owes much to that work for method, stimulus, matter, and suggestiveness.

Having apologized in his preface for the appearance of his book, by saying that the Coccejan Typology had lived itself out, and men were no longer satisfied in their study of the Old Testament with the shell which they had so long mistaken for the kernel, and that therefore there was a keenly felt and widely expressed desire for an inquiry, comprehensive or detailed, into the meaning of the Mosaic ceremonial, Bähr explains in his introduction that he understands by the Mosaic ceremonial that system of divine worship described in the second, third, and fourth Books of the Pentateuch. That system, he continues, is a complete whole. "It accurately defines the place of worship (the Tabernacle), it appoints special persons for the conduct of worship (priests), it prescribes certain holy acts (sacrifices and purifications), and directs that there shall be special times for worship (feasts):" the investigation must thus divide itself into these four parts. But before proceeding to this investigation, Bähr dwells awhile upon the general form of the ceremonial. It is, in the first place, antipodal to the spiritual worship of the New Testament; the entire ceremonial is representative; "everything in it, from the least to the greatest, is purely sensuous; the whole worship is knit with externality." Secondly, it is representative in this sense, that it is at once symbolical and typical (*symbolisch und typisch*). The Mosaic ceremonial was symbolical, for it gave a sensuous representation of religious ideas; it was typical, that is to say, *prophetically symbolic*, for, in accordance with the divine plan that the Law should prepare the way for the Gospel, it was the lower stage of a religion to be more fully developed hereafter. Having made this explanation, Bähr then excludes the typical aspect of the Law from his inquiry, and deals only with the symbolical aspect. For the study of

this symbolical aspect he then lays down certain rules. The first, which he designates unquestionable, is that "the symbolic cultus represents both in its generality and its detail such ideas and truths as harmonize with the known and recognised principles of Mosaism." According to the second rule, "the meaning of individual symbols is especially conditioned by an accurate knowledge of their nature." Thirdly, "the meaning of many a symbol may be ascertained from its name." Fourthly, "each symbol has but one meaning." The fifth rule is, "that each symbol has always the same fundamental signification, however different may be the connection or association in which it stands." And the last is, that "in every symbol, whether it be a thing or an act, that which constitutes it a symbol must be accurately distinguished from that which is necessary thereto, and has therefore simply a subordinate and auxiliary purpose." By the aid of these several rules—that the interpretations adopted be suitable in time, nature, and etymology, that they be unequivocal in themselves and in their use, and that they be not pushed to extremes—Dr. Bähr conducts his long investigation. In his first book he treats of the Tabernacle, its ground plan, the materials of which it was formed, the colours and artistic figures which characterized it, and the utensils of the Holiest, the Holy Place, and the Court; in his second book, of the priesthood, its orders, vestments, and initiatory ceremonies; in the third book, of the sacrifices and purifications; and in the fourth, of the sacrificial times and seasons.

The peculiar weakness and strength of the method of Bähr can nowhere be more fitly seen than in his chapters upon that portion of the Mosaic ritual most closely allied with our subject. A brief review of the general features of the sacrificial worship having been sketched at the beginning of the third book of his great work, Dr. Bähr at once proceeds to study the essence and idea of the Mosaic sacrifices. Justly enough, he finds this essence in the common designation *qorban*, which signifies "nothing more than bringing a gift."[1] If it be asked, he continues, how gifts can become means of grace, the answer must be found in the nature of those gifts. Those

[1] *Symbolik*, vol. ii. p. 196.

gifts were either blood or bloodless offerings; but the bloodless offerings occupied quite a subordinate relation. It is in the blood sacrifices, therefore, that we must look for the more intimate idea of Mosaic sacrifices; and the significance of these blood sacrifices he rightly infers, from Leviticus xvii. 11, to lie in their faculty of atonement. "The meaning of sacrificing is therefore briefly this, that the psychical (sinful) essence (life) is surrendered to God in death, in order to obtain the true essence (holiness) through the union with God, the true Being, and therefore the Holy One. The relation of the soul in the blood of the victim to the soul of the offerer is therefore that of a substitute, to denote which the words *ἀντι* (*ἀντιψυχα*) and *loco* might be employed, alien as they are to the usage of the Pentateuch; but this substitution is no formal exchange of parts, no external and actual substitution, but one purely symbolic, so that the act of sacrifice, if what it represented did not actually take place on the part of the offerer, appeared void and fruitless. . . . This moment (of self-surrender) constitutes sacrifice a sacramental act, in which the blood appears as the divinely appointed means of covering the sin of the soul, of bringing into union with Jehovah, and so sanctifying. In the Law this sacramental character of sacrifice is prominently brought forward, as the passage which has formed our text expressly states: 'I have given it' (the blood) 'to you, to make an atonement for your souls.'"[1] Two things are here asserted,—the one, that the essential feature of sacrifice is atonement; and the other, that atonement is wrought by a symbolic presentation to God of the soul of the offerer. These two positions occur again and again in the course of the discussions, and, being both unscriptural, vitiate the whole conclusions upon the sacrificial rites. It will be sufficient to illustrate by excerpts from his analysis the second point as to the nature of atonement. According to Bähr, the material presented for sacrifice, whether consisting of animal or vegetable products, symbolically represented the person of the offerer. "The appropriate material for sacrifice was—from the animal kingdom, oxen, goats, and sheep; from the vegetable kingdom, corn, oil, and wine; salt and incense are mere additions. . . .

[1] *Ibid.* vol. ii. pp. 211, 212.

Now these three kinds of animals together form the peculiar live-stock of the Israelites, all breeding of cattle amongst them having to do with these species especially—yea, exclusively. . . . The three vegetable substances—corn, oil, and wine—together form the next essential and most important products of the soil of Palestine. . . . As, therefore, the first division of the sacrificial material consists of the representatives of stock-keeping, so the second consists of the representatives of agriculture; whilst both pursuits, the breeding of cattle and the tilling of land, together form the staple of the Israelitish polity. The external existence of the people is inseparable from them, and conditioned by them, since Israel was restricted by the Mosaic institutions from being a commercial, a military, or a nomadic people. . . . What was offered in sacrifice in Israel was the means of Israel's very existence. . . . . Sacrifice in its essence was the surrender of what was peculiarly one's own, the surrender of the individual self, of the *nephesh*—that is, of the principle of personality, or of the individual life."[1] The presenting of the victim at the altar was thus the presentation of oneself to Jehovah.[2] The imposition of the hand is "the surrender of the very self to Jehovah in death, the consecration to death for Jehovah:"—"The hand, the limb with which we hold and give, is laid by the offerer upon the animal to signify that it belongs to him, is his property; but the hand is laid upon the head to signify that the animal is consecrated to death, a parallel to the common expression concerning the blood returning upon a man's head."[3] "In the mactation, we have the completion of this readiness for entire surrender symbolically expressed."[4] With respect to the manipulation with the blood: "If, as has been seen, the blood represents the soul of the offerer, the sprinkling of the blood on any of the holy places can have no other significance than the presentation of the soul at the places where the Holy Jehovah reveals Himself, the soul by that means receiving an assurance of that holiness, yea, becoming itself sanctified—that is to say, its sin being exterminated, covered, atoned:"—"In the act of sprink-

[1] *Symbolik*, vol. ii. pp. 315–317.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 337.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 341.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 343.

ling, the soul of the offerer comes into peculiar contact and union with holiness." [1]

Now, it is no portion of our duty to analyze and weigh minutely the detailed examination made by Dr. Bähr of the Mosaic worship, but simply to indicate those leading errors in his method, or his results, which have vitiated his contributions to the scriptural doctrine of Sacrifice. Those errors are three in number. In the first place, he has insufficiently brought into notice the double character of Mosaic sacrifices. Firmly as the element of *atonement* has been seized, the element of *presentation* is regarded as of little value. To the high importance manifestly attached in the Law to the blood sacrifices, he has given a one-sided interpretation, having altogether missed the fact that the blood sacrifices were as evidently presentations as they were means of atonement. It will have already occurred to the discriminating reader that the doctrine of Mosaic atonement is held in no scriptural sense; but, passing that by for the moment, there is no Levitical support for the opinion that atonement was the paramount idea in sacrificing. As has been seen throughout the course of this investigation, the ideas of atonement and presentation exist side by side, and with at least equal prominence in the Mosaic ritual; and to change this parallel relation, is to introduce a source of frequent misunderstanding and inevitable error. The reader has only to compare Dr. Bähr's interpretation of the common sacrificial ritual just given with the interpretation which a sound and broad-eyed exegesis warrants, to see the natural consequences of this narrowness of vision. Secondly, by ignoring the necessity for the accurate determination of what we have termed the essential significance of the Mosaic injunctions, before proceeding to the study of the symbolism those injunctions sanction, Dr. Bähr has allowed an entrance to abundant caprice. Instead of restricting himself to the interpretations which the Law itself afforded of its manifold injunctions, and manfully declaring that he could not profess to show the way where the Law did not lead, he assumes that all injunctions are symbolic which are not manifestly auxiliary to the symbolic; and he also takes for granted

[1] *Symbolik*, vol. ii. pp. 345, 346.

that these symbolic injunctions may be interpreted by some faculty of the human mind quite apart from the express teaching of the Law. It has not occurred to Dr. Bähr that there are some precepts of the Law purposely left unexplained, in order to arouse and foster a conviction that in Mosaism the final word had not been spoken concerning human redemption. It is true that recourse is had time after time in the *Symbolik*, and that according to rule, to the biblical name attached to various symbols, and to the nature of the symbol as described in the Pentateuch; it is true, therefore, that what we have called the essential significance is now and again called in to solve the mysteries of the prescribed symbolism: what we allege to be a defect is that any other method of solution is at any time adopted. The sole key to the symbolic significance of the Mosaic injunctions, is to be found in the essential significance; and to suppose that any other keys will pass, is to waste precious time and excite unreasonable hopes in the trying of skeletons, which may fit isolated wards, and that is all: there is scarcely a page of Dr. Bähr's book which is not a commentary upon this statement. And this introduces the third great source of error—viz. that by summoning to his aid in the interpretation of Mosaism information extra-biblical, there has been displayed "a wisdom above what is written," and interpretations have been imagined where none has at the time been imparted. To take a crucial instance, How came the learned author to say that the presentation of animal blood symbolically proffered the soul of the offerer? This is nowhere said or implied in the laws of Moses. It is said that "the blood atones through the soul;" but that is but a statement of the fact that the blood of the substituted animal is employed by divine command as a means of atonement for the offerer. It is never said in any manner of circumlocution, that the blood of the animal slain atones for the offerer by symbolically representing the soul of the offerer. Unquestionably, the rites of blood were symbolic; but of what they were symbolic the Law nowhere states, nor did the Old Testament until the famous prophecy of the Servant of the Lord. Besides, into what inextricable confusion are we plunged by such an interpretation of the ritual of blood! The symbolic repre-

sentation of a man's self must be immaculate! The slightest physical defect will constitute the symbolic representation null and void! This symbolic representation of his own soul atones by being brought into the closest contact with Jehovah! That which symbolically represents himself is "most holy"—"a sweet-smelling savour"—to Jehovah! The fact is, that with all his profession of a double explication of Mosaism, a symbolic and a typical, Dr. Bähr's explication is exclusively symbolic; and so far from confessing that there are features in the Mosaic worship unintelligible to the Jew, inasmuch as they symbolically represent facts not revealed to his age, with astounding ingenuity worthy of a better cause Dr. Bähr set himself to evolve from his consciousness and from heathen literature the solutions of symbols which he assumes the Jew must have known.

In the same year that Bähr's second volume was published, Hengstenberg issued the third volume of his *Contributions to the Introduction to the Old Testament*,[1] in which some considerable elucidations were attempted of the theory of Mosaic sacrifice. A far less purely symbolic standpoint was assumed. Thus Hengstenberg clearly saw the double purpose for which the Sinaitic sacrifices were ordained, and brought into due prominence both the element of atonement and the element of presentation. Inasmuch, however, as many of his views subsequently underwent modification, as is evident from the Academic Lecture[2] upon Sacrifice, which he afterwards published, we do not give any analysis of his special theories. The leading points of his special view were, the double purpose of animal sacrifice, the interpretation of symbolism by the express words of Scripture, and the necessity of consulting Christianity for the explanation of many symbols left unexplained in pre-Christian times.

Under the influence of these two works of Bähr and Hengstenberg, considerable impetus was given to the study of the Old Testament worship, and a large literature speedily

[1] *Beiträgen zur Einleitung ins A. T.*, vol. iii. 1839.

[2] The Lecture was printed in the *Evang. Kirchenzeitung* for 1852, and was subsequently issued as a pamphlet, entitled *Die Opfer der heiligen Schrift*, 1859 (translated as an appendix to his *Commentary on Ecclesiastes*, T. & T. Clark).

accumulated, which might be roughly classified according as the authors sided with the one or with the other. Thus, referring only to the leaders in the strife, Hävernick, Tholuck, Oehler, Neumann, Ritschl, Ewald, Knobel, Kalisch, Schultz, may be regarded as adherents to the purely symbolic standpoint of Bähr; and Ebrard, Fairbairn, Keil, Kliefoth, Kurtz, Küper, Thomasius, Wangemann, as adherents of the partly symbolic view of Hengstenberg. But against all, without a single exception, the objection may be urged which was urged against Bähr, that, by the absence of some such precise principle as that by which what we have termed the essential significance was obtained, they have opened the sluices to a very flood of unverifiable surmises. A more serious consequence of this omission has been, as will be more evident during the course of the next book, the obscuration of the relation of the New Covenant to the Old.

Even Kurtz, distinguished advocate as he is of the juridical view of sacrifice, has not escaped this grave error of the extra-biblical interpretation of symbolism. Kurtz has exhaustively treated the Mosaic ritual in his great work upon the *Sacrificial Worship of the Old Testament*, issued as at once a maturer form of an earlier work upon *The Mosaic Sacrifice*, and the first instalment of a supplement to the second volume of his well-known *History of the Old Covenant*. This later treatise was divided into four books, in the first of which a preliminary investigation is undertaken into the general basis of the sacrificial worship of the Old Testament, and such questions are answered as by whom, where, and in what different forms, sacrifices were made. It will be sufficient for our purpose to extract his general theory of sacrifice. The sacrifices themselves are divided into three classes,—viz. levies for the support of the priests and Levites, consisting of tithes and firstlings of fruit, cattle, and men; holy gifts for the endowment of the sanctuary; and altar sacrifices for the personal appropriation of the Deity, consisting of blood offerings of the four kinds, and the bloodless offerings which were presented in the court of the Tabernacle and in the Holy Place. To the consideration of this third class, alone in his esteem deserving of the name of sacrifices,

the remainder of the work is devoted, the blood sacrifices being treated in the second book, the bloodless sacrifices in the third, and certain modifications of the legal worship seen at special times and under special circumstances in the fourth. A word or two in passing may be given to the arbitrary restriction of view to what are called the altar sacrifices. The Levitical laws countenance no such distinction; and a theory of the sacrificial worship of the Old Testament is convicted of incompleteness which does not treat of such sacrifices, as we are warranted by the Mosaic injunctions in calling them, as the tithes, the firstlings, and the gifts for the construction and maintenance of the Tabernacle; insignificant as such things appear, their presentation was a religious act, and formed an important part of the sacrificial system of Mosaism. But it is a far more serious stricture which his general views necessitate. The reply which is made by Kurtz as to the significance of animal sacrifice is erroneous; his is an unscriptural theory of Mosaic atonement. His general theory of atonement may be inferred from his remarks upon the material used in animal sacrifice. Those animals, he considers, were available for sacrifice which "stood *in a biotic relation* to the offerer."[1] "The choice of the materials for the altar sacrifices . . . represented a personal self-surrender to the Person of Jehovah; and if this self-surrender of man to God was to find expression not merely ideally in thought or verbally in prayer, but in a visible and comprehensible act, and if, besides, as had been unalterably determined (since the sacrifice of Abraham), this fact might not assume the form of a real human sacrifice, nothing remained but to employ some other thing as a symbolic representative or substitute which seemed qualified for that purpose by close and essential relations with the offerer; for this purpose . . . it was necessary that the offering should stand in a psychico-biotic *rapport* to the person of the offerer himself and his vital powers."[2] In brief, then, the animal sacrificed symbolically personated, in the opinion of Kurtz, the life and labours of the sacrificer. From this fundamental assumption, it

[1] *Alttest. Opfercultus*, § 34: "In einem biotischen Rapport."
[2] *Alttest. Opfercultus*, § 22.

follows that the imposition of hands is a dedication of the victim to suffer the punishment due to the person it symbolically represented, the slaughtering is the actual endurance of that suffering, and the sprinkling of the blood is the bringing before God the blood of the substitute. We need not proceed farther; in this view, atonement was effected by a vicarious endurance of the punishment of death due to the offerer, the vicarious suffering being borne by an animal, the symbolic representative of the offerer. Thus we see Kurtz himself gliding into the gigantic and irreconcilable error which vitiated the valuable researches of Bähr; and although in many places he ignores his own conclusions, it can only be said of him, as he himself has so caustically said of Keil, that he "repeatedly recurs to the ecclesiastical and traditional view, and thus strays into remarkable contradictions; and it is to be regretted that of these contradictions he is unconscious, or he would assuredly have held fast throughout, and not merely in isolated passages, to the old and well-tried truth instead of to his new and indefensible discoveries."

To sum up our review of the contributions of the Biblico-Theological School of Germany towards our special subject, one great standing objection must be taken, in spite of their ardour and scholarship, to the numerous followers of Bähr and Hengstenberg—their limitation of view. The transitory they have viewed as final, and the splendid course of scriptural development as sharply defined and fully mature. To have endeavoured to seize the salient points of resemblance and difference in the several stages of the scriptural doctrine of Sacrifice, would have afforded them that breadth of view which transforms the pedant into a philosopher, and would have saved them many a blunder and much confusion. Had their gaze not been wholly fixed upon the Levitical constitution as it issued from the lips of its founder, they would have seen, for example, what they have otherwise almost ignored, the singular preparation of the field in patriarchal times, they would have appreciated more accurately the silences of Leviticus, they would have admired the wonderful provision made for the assimilation of the Mosaic code by the teaching of holy men and the tangled experiences of a nation, they

would have delineated the slow and sure advance of prophecy towards its final goal, and they would have gained a more vital and true conception of the relation of the worship of the Old Testament to that of the New; as it is, from a pitiable narrowness of vision, they have pushed the one true principle of the symbolical significance of the Mosaic injunctions to unwarrantable issues. The Biblical Theologians of Germany, and their numerous English followers, who have undertaken the study of the scriptural doctrine of sacrifice, have added to the stores of Biblical Archæology, and have collected almost cyclopædic masses of facts from which true conclusions may be formed; most assuredly they have not ascertained, nor endeavoured to ascertain, the scriptural doctrine even of Old Testament Sacrifice.

But before closing this review, a few words should be given to the modern *naturalistic* explanation of the Old Testament sacrifices. There are those to-day who see, they think, that, as Kalisch expresses it, "the Levitical laws were the result of many generations, and the work of many minds," that these laws "were not moulded on a definite and preconceived plan," that, "for many centuries after Moses, the Levitical ordinances were neither practised nor known," that the Festal Times and Seasons of Leviticus only "attained their final form during the time of Zerubbabel's Temple," and that such a ceremonial as that of the Day of Atonement, so far from being revealed to Moses, "demanded the incessant labours of a thousand years." From such convictions have come the naturalistic theories of Old Testament sacrifice which are presented in Kuenen's *Religion of Israel*,[1] in Wellhausen's *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*,[2] and in Robertson Smith's *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites*.[3] Now, tempting as it would be to show how these several theories, and especially the last, do

[1] *The Religion of Israel to the Fall of the Jewish State*, translated from the Dutch by Alfred Heath, May 1874.

[2] *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, with a reprint of the article "Israel" from the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, by Julius Wellhausen, translated from the German, under the Author's supervision, by F. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies, with a preface by Prof. W. Robertson Smith, 1885.

[3] *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites*, First Series, The Fundamental Institutions, 1889.

not explain, but explain away, the sacrificial system of the Old Testament, is there not wisdom in remembering that such a demonstration would be only playing at war? The real question at issue is a question of standpoint. The battle must be a battle of standpoints; and it is idle to hope for victory by guerilla warfare on a point here, or an outwork there. Is the Old Testament, or is it not, a record of express divine revelations?—this is the question, the real question at issue; and it would be well if both sides frankly acknowledged this. Now in this book the examination of the Old Testament religion has been conducted throughout on the assumptions—first, that this Old Testament Faith was supernatural in origin, being based on a series of special divine revelations made to patriarchs and prophets; and, secondly, that the Levitical laws were revealed to Moses. But these are not the assumptions of the naturalistic critics of the Old Testament sacrifices. Their postulates are, first, that the Old Testament religion, not being specific revelation, has no divine authority; and, secondly, that the Levitical laws, so far from being divine revelation to Moses, resulted from the thinking of religious Jews throughout many centuries. Naturalistic Evolution, these scholars say, more or less explicitly, is the source of the Hebrew religion: Supernatural Revelation as the source of the Hebrew Faith this book everywhere assumes. The difference of view is a difference of principle. Every detail considered, must be considered in the light of principle. Manifestly, therefore, this is not the place for controverting the contentions of this school of critics. What the present writer has to say, by way of defence of his own views, and by way of criticism of these opposed views, may be found in his "Congregational Lecture on the Inspiration of the Old Testament,"[1] where a detailed examination is made of the historical, literary, and revealed character of the Old Testament religion, as an indispensable preliminary to any inductive study of the Inspiration of the Old Testament. Adequate examination cannot be undertaken here. A veiled Hegelianism, having

[1] *The Inspiration of the Old Testament Inductively Considered*, the Seventh Congregational Union Lecture, 1st ed. 1888; 2nd ed. 1889.

been defeated in its assault upon the New Testament, is now attacking the Old Testament, and requires to be fought in the citadel of its philosophic principles. At least this is the conviction of the present writer. These naturalistic views are the outgrowth of a philosophic tendency, and the criticism of a tendency can only be advantageously conducted by a criticism of its postulates as well as of its instances, its minutiæ, its detail. Where principles are at stake, a brief criticism would be valueless.

CHAPTER V.

THE TRANSITION.

"Und ihr habt alle guten Eigenschaften eines Elementarbuchs sowohl für Kinder als für ein kindisches Volk."—LESSING, *Der Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts*, § 50.

WE set ourselves to ascertain the scriptural doctrine of Sacrifice; and now that we have reached the close of the Old Testament canon, it is advisable to recall the leading results of our investigation. Having repudiated as unscriptural the application of the theory of evolution to explain the origin of sacrifice, we saw that the primary necessity for any doctrine of sacrifice at all lay in the Fall of Man. The problem of sacrifice was seen, in fact, to be the restoration of the ideal state of paradisaic sacrifice.

Towards the solution of this problem, we have seen two currents of revelation incessantly converging—the one having its spring in the original promise made to Adam; and the other, in the divine recognition of Abel's sacrifice.

Of the revelations concerning a future deliverer, it has not fallen within our scope to speak at more length than sufficed to indicate how, as ages passed by, the promise became more and more defined, until at length it told of One, at once the Son of God and the Son of David, Who should establish an eternal kingdom.

Of the continuous enlargement of the scheme of sacrifice, it has of course fallen to our lot to speak at length. From the date of Abel's sacrifice—that extraordinary and memorable feeling after God if haply He might be found—a kind of gospel had proclaimed itself, as we have seen, to man, that the sacrifice of self and substance would be acceptable to God so long as the method of presentation displayed in

outward form a recognition of that divine precedent upon which Abel had so intelligently and trustfully acted.

We have also seen that this undifferentiated form of sacrifice, in which the burning of an animal represented, and at the same time satisfied, religious feelings the most opposite and various, was continued with but slight modifications throughout the Patriarchal Age.

We have further traced how, after the transitional sacrifices of the Passover and of the Covenant, the revelation concerning this Old Testament form of worship advanced another stage, and how the patriarchal offerings were superseded by an elaborate cultus, in which minute directions were divinely given concerning the one legitimate place of presentation, the one legitimate class of ministrants, the one legitimate ritual of purifications and gifts, and the one legitimate calendar of that ritual. The significance of this Mosaic system was then passed under review, when we discovered that ceremonial to have been at once symbolical and sacramental,—that is to say, to have expressed in sensuous and inadequate form certain spiritual facts which the Law itself unmistakeably interpreted, and to have been the divinely appointed channel of spiritual blessings which mere symbols could never have bestowed.

How, after these Mosaic injunctions, with all their opulence, had been confided to the reverent keeping of the nation, they passed through a lengthy period of assimilation and development, and how, by the recital of the experiences of holy men and the announcement of the divine messages made through the mouth of prophets on the one hand, and on the other by the continuous experiences gained during the course of a national history unusually chequered, the nature and the importance of the Mosaic sacrificial worship were indelibly stamped upon the heart of the people, we have also narrated.

It has thus been seen that the peculiarity of the whole range of the post-paradisaic and pre-Christian sacrifices was its materialistic garb. From first to last, we have observed that the presentation of blood and bloodless sacrifices has either been approved or commanded by God. At first sight, this startling fact seemed to stamp the Old Testament revela-

tion with inconsistency. If animal or vegetable offerings were presented at all, that they should be valuable for the ideas they conveyed, and not for their intrinsic merit, was sufficiently harmonious with the Old Testament conception of the Most High; and that animal and vegetable sacrifices, if offered at all, should become instruments in the divine hands for imparting manifold blessings, this also beautifully harmonized with the Old Testament revelation of an overarching and all-pervading Providence; but that such material offerings should be made with the divine approbation and by the divine command, there lay a difficulty. But, as we have had to remark several times in our previous exposition, the Old Testament rid itself of the difficulty by postponing its solution. The Old Testament asserted, in fact, at first by subtle suggestion, then by necessary inference, and lastly by express statement, the transitory and preparatory nature of its divine economy. It is, as we have distinctly pointed out now and again in the course of the preceding discussion, the express teaching both of the Law and the Prophets, that the patriarchal and Mosaic rituals, whilst fulfilling immediate ends in the times to which those rituals were more especially addressed, had a preparative and predictive purport. Sacrifice and Tabernacle, taken in conjunction with the word of Jehovah, had an element of prophecy, and pointed to a Tabernacle and Sacrifice yet to come; that eluding prophetic element was caught, reiterated, illustrated, expanded, intensified, made current coin, in the burning and persuasive words of those elect spirits, whose converse was with God in a miraculous sense, and whose authority was popularly regarded as superior to that of priest or judge or king.

But, as we have further elicited, the Old Testament did not entirely postpone the solution of the difficulty that cannot but be found in the divine ordination of material sacrifices. For a long time silent upon the purport of this worship by blood and giving, it was not silent for ever. Just at this unsolved point of sacrificial worship, the later prophetical testimony attached itself. If the rites of Abraham and Moses imparted a dim prophetic evidence concerning their innermost meaning, that evidence was rendered brighter and

clearer by the utterances of Isaiah and his successors. To the fact, which the Law itself announced, that the sacrificial rites were typical, the prophet added the further fact that they were in some way typical of Him, the Son of God and the Son of David, Who should inaugurate a worthy kingdom of God by the sacrifice of Himself for sin. From the time of the prophecies of the evangelical Isaiah, the two currents of revelation, concerning the Messiah and concerning sacrifice, were united into one broad stream, promising world-wide beneficence; and from the time of the prophecy of Daniel, the very year of the ceasing of the old and the inauguration of the new had been proclaimed. Not only does the Old Testament explain its sacrificial system by pointing to Him Who shall be a sacrifice indeed, but declares the time when that true sacrifice shall be slain and the paradisaic sacrifice restored in a measure.

Thus, under the teaching of the Old Testament itself, there was that in all these material arrangements of gifts with and without blood, which, in moments of deeper insight, might conduct the pious Jew into an almost infinite vista of thought, the vanishing-point of which was ultimate truth and intellectual rest. At such times of insight the Tabernacle with its structural divisions and degrees of access might seem to present the stages of redemption "foreshortened," and to intimate a threefold course for the history of salvation, in which the more privileged service of the priest should first supersede the service of the court, and this priestly service give place in its turn to the open vision as of angels before the throne. Then, the visible and imperfect priesthood would be suddenly lost to view in the prospect of a priesthood truly holy and a mediation spiritually adequate: then the rites of sacrifice would sometimes become instantaneously transformed, and in those domestic creatures which had been reared by his own energies,—in "those most human offerings," [1] to adopt the felicitous phrase of De Maistre,—a human substitute might appear, in the spotlessness of those victims, the

[1] "On choisissait toujours parmi les animaux les plus innocents, *les plus en rapport avec l'homme* par leurs instincts et leurs habitudes—*les victimes les plus humaines.*"—De Maistre, *Les Soirées de St. Petersbourg*, vol. ii. p. 234.

sinlessness of that substitute, and in the pouring out of their blood the vicarious suffering of that death decreed upon human sin in Eden: then, in isolated moments of elevation, it was a very light from the cross that streamed into the sinful heart.

Briefly stated, therefore, the advance that the Old Testament made towards the solution of the great problem of the restoration of the blessed times of paradisaic sacrifice may be said to be this, that the Old Testament, whilst itself satisfying by sacrament and symbol the religious wants of the Jew, announced and prepared the way for that solution of the problem which the future should unfold. To that future solution we proceed in the next book.

BOOK II.

PLEROMATIC.

'Behold the Lamb of God!"—JOHN i. 29.

CHAPTER I.

THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE GENERALLY CONSIDERED.

"Tempore Veteris Testamenti Novum Testamentum occultatum ibi erat tanquam fructus in radice."—AUGUSTINE, *Enarratio in Psalmum* LXII.

TO pass from the doctrine of the Old Testament to that of the New is to enter a changed world. It is as if we had lived through an Arctic winter, our long night occasionally lit as by an aurora, or by stars, and had suddenly chanced upon a warm and glorious summer with its unsetting sun and nightless day. The age of symbols is no more. Faint adumbrations of heavenly truths under material forms have given place to the clear proclamation of the same truths under those least material forms of speech and life. There is less of sense, more of spirit; man is not now assured of saving truth by an elaborate education in a complicated ritual of blood and gifts: "The light which lighteth every man" is education enough for the full appropriation of the New Testament revelation. Something of the intercourse and worship of Eden is restored. The fulness of time is come: the race has attained its majority; and, admitted to the privileges of heirship, the sacred mysteries of our little interval between the eternity before and after are no longer taught by covert allusion and minute law, line upon line, precept upon precept, but by the familiar, loving, and respectful communion as of father and son. "Now speakest Thou plainly, and speakest no proverb," is the language of the disciple of Jesus to his Master.

From the great mass of New Testament statement the New Testament teaching concerning Sacrifice accretes around distinct nuclei, and ultimately crystallizes into two well-defined doctrines,—*concerning the Sacrifice of Christ, and the Sacrifice of man.*

That is, in the New Testament, as in the Old, the doctrine of Sacrifice resolves itself into the doctrine of Atonement and the doctrine of Presentation.

By way of introduction to what follows, let us briefly pass under review the statements of the New Testament which form the data of these two doctrines.

And, first, of the New Testament doctrine of sacrificial Atonement, where by Atonement is meant, as in the Old Testament, the rendering sin powerless to arouse the wrath of God.

The association of Jesus Christ with the sacrificial rites of the Old Testament was clearly made by the Forerunner. When John the Baptist, breaking the silence of centuries, assumed the prophetic garb, and awoke in Pharisee and Sadducee the conviction that the God of Israel was condescending once more to speak through chastened human lips, it is undeniable that those incisive cries from the wilderness, "Repent," "Wrath to come," "Prepare ye the way of the Lord," were welcomed as an announcement that the glorious days of David and Solomon were about to be eclipsed, and the theocratic visions of Micah and Hosea to be fulfilled; is it not equally undeniable that those stirring appeals pointed to the fulfilment of the sacrificial visions of the prophets? If John took up the strain of ancient prophecy, and sounded the reveille of that morning which was the birthday of the world-wide kingdom of God; if his cry to repentance was justly interpreted as the heralding of the greater and eternal Son of David; not less clearly did the Baptist take up the other side of the prophetic revelation, and declare that the heavenly kingdom should take its rise, as had been foretold by Daniel, Zechariah, and Isaiah, in the atoning death of the King who would be at once offerer, priest, and victim, and who would rely on no authority more potent than the attractive power of His own blood. That the erroneous chiliastic views of the Jewish leaders, adopted as a one-sided interpretation of prophecy, had no countenance in the proclamations of the Nazarite prophet, may be readily seen from the fragments of his teaching which have reached us. One day, whilst baptizing, we are told that John selected Jesus as the Lamb of God

who should bear the sins of the world: "Behold the Lamb of God, Who taketh away the sins of the world!"[1] Now it is not enough to find here a representation of "that state of mind for which all alike sigh, and the want of which makes life a failure to most;"[2] "that confidence which had never been disturbed, that stedfast peace which no agitations of life could ruffle;" "that heaven which is everywhere, if we could but enter it;" that "royalty of inward happiness." Although such a mental state has something to do with the figure employed, the phrase has an unmistakeable reference to the Jewish sacrifices; and whether the allusion be to Christ as the antitype of the paschal lamb, or of the lamb of the daily burnt-offerings, or of those sin-offerings in which lambs were brought, or whether John is simply alluding, in the general language of sacrifice, to the famous prophecy of Isaiah, certain it is that Jesus is here described under sacrificial terminology. The announcement of John was that the time was at hand when the prophecy of an atoning as well as regal Messiah was to be fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth.

But this announcement of John's concerning the atoning Messiah is the burden of the New Testament, as may be gathered from the numerous passages which any habitual reader could at once suggest. Inadequately as the sacrificial language of the New Testament has been rendered in the Authorized Version, the renderings of that may suffice for the present to bring the fact before us. Jesus speaks of His "blood" as that of "the New Testament" . . . "shed for many, for the remission of sins."[3] Elsewhere we read of the "redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath sent forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood;"[4] of "being justified by His blood;"[5] of "joying in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement;"[6] of Christ's having "died for our sins;"[7] of His having given "Himself for our sins;"[8] of Christ having "reconciled us in the body of His flesh;"[9] of our having

[1] John i. 29.
[2] *Ecce Homo*, p. 6.
[3] Matt. xxvi. 28; Mark xiv. 24; Luke xxii. 20.
[4] Rom. iii. 24, 25.
[5] Rom. v. 9.
[6] Rom. v. 11.
[7] 1 Cor. xv. 3.
[8] Gal. i. 4.
[9] Col. i. 21, 22.

"redemption through His blood."[1] In another place the *a fortiori* argument is boldly stated: "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?"[2] The same writer adds in another place, that "now once in the end of the world hath Christ appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself;"[3] in yet another place he describes the body of Jesus as "one sacrifice for sins for ever."[4] In another Epistle we read "of being redeemed, not with corruptible things, as silver and gold, . . . but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot."[5] In the Epistle of John it is said that "Jesus is the propitiation for our sins,"[6] and that His blood "cleanseth from all sins."[7] Further, as the veil is momentarily withdrawn from the unseen world, ever and anon there comes into prominence "the Lamb as it had been slain,"[8] Who "loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood," and "hath made us kings and priests."

Then, secondly, of the New Testament doctrine of Presentation. Turning to another series of statements in the Authorized Version, we further find that certain phases of the Christian life are described under the sacrificial language of the Old Testament. "I beseech you therefore, brethren," writes Paul to the Romans, "by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies *a living sacrifice*, holy, acceptable to God, your reasonable service."[9] The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews writes: "By Him therefore let us offer the *sacrifice of praise* to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to His name. But to do good and to communicate forget not: for with such *sacrifices* God is well pleased."[10] "Ye also," says Peter to the Jews of the dispersion who had entered into Christian fellowship,—"Ye also, as living stones,

[1] Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14.
[2] Heb. ix. 13, 14.
[3] Heb. ix. 26.
[4] Heb. x. 10–12.
[5] 1 Pet. i. 18, 19.
[6] 1 John ii. 2, iv. 10.
[7] 1 John i. 7.
[8] Rev. v. 6, and i. 5, 6.
[9] Rom. xii. 1.
[10] Heb. xiii. 15, 16.

are built up a *spiritual house*, a *holy priesthood*, to offer up *spiritual sacrifices*, acceptable to God by Christ Jesus." [1] Nor does Paul hesitate to call the free-will offerings of the Church at Philippi for his support "a *sacrifice* acceptable, well-pleasing to God." [2]

To the concatenation and elucidation of these two classes of facts, viz. that the life and work, first, of Christ, and, second, of His disciples, are described throughout the New Testament under language borrowed from the sacrificial worship of the Old Testament, and to the investigation of the affinity of these two classes of facts to the sacrificial doctrine of the Old Testament, the remainder of this book will be devoted. And, first, of the New Testament doctrine of the atoning work of Christ — as described in sacrificial language — its doctrine as given in the New Testament — its history — and its relation to the Old Testament doctrine of Atonement.

[1] 1 Pet. ii. 5. [2] Phil. iv. 18

CHAPTER II.

THE NEW TESTAMENT DESCRIPTION OF THE ATONING WORK OF CHRIST AS SACRIFICIAL.

"Αὐτὸς ἱερεῖον, αὐτὸς θῦμα, αὐτὸς ἱερεύς, αὐτὸς ἐυσιαστήριον, αὐτὸς Θεὸς, αὐτος ἄνθρωπος, αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς, αὐτὸς ἀρχιερεὺς, αὐτὸς πρόβατον, αὐτὸς ἀρνίον, τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν."—EPIPHANIUS, *Hæreses*, cap. lv.

OUR theme, then, at present is the New Testament doctrine of Atonement, — that is to say, the New Testament doctrine of the atoning work of Jesus. For describing this atoning work, the apostles already found a language prepared in the sacrificial system of the Old Testament. So we have just seen by a few citations from the Authorized Version. The fact is to be further illustrated before proceeding.

For it would be an insufficient elaboration of the method hitherto pursued, if, in order to prove that the New Testament describes the atoning work of Christ under the sacrificial terminology of Judaism, a few passages selected here and there from the heterogeneous contents of the Authorized Version were quoted. If a knowledge of the original is advantageous in the study of the Scriptures, it is especially valuable in the subject before us, inasmuch as precision has frequently been lost in the process of a double translation. A reference to the first appendix[1] will convince that it was with considerable difficulty that the Septuagint interpreters managed to convey with many errors (inexcusable if not unavoidable) the scriptural regulations and allusions of Mosaism; and, again diminishing the advisability of reliance upon any version, the vagueness and errors of the Hellenistic translation have been vaguely and erroneously rendered in the English New Testament. It therefore behoves us to demonstrate the

[1] See Appendix I. B.

thesis of this chapter by an examination of the New Testament, as far as concerns our subject, in the language in which it was originally written, and, further, by a careful emendation of that language by a minute comparison with the technicalities of the Hebrew.

If at first sight it should appear that no linguistic task could be more difficult than to compare the sacrificial terminology of the Old Testament, written as it was in the Shemitic Hebrew, with that of the New in the Arian Greek, the solution of the paradox is simple. It lies in the fact, previously hinted at, that we possess the Old Testament not only as it was first written, but in the Alexandrine version, popularly known as the Septuagint, of which, whatever questions there may be as to its authorship or correctness in minor points, or whatever difficulty there may be in reconciling the testimonies of Aristeas and Epiphanius, and in ascertaining its exact text from its various manuscripts, it may be justly said that it affords invaluable lexicographic aid as an interpreter between the Hebrew of the Old and the Greek of the New. It will therefore be by the mediation of the Septuagint that we shall discover and illuminate similar sacrificial references in Law and Gospel.

And this is the place to enter a protest against the practice, as common as it is disastrous, of identifying Hellenistic and Classical Greek in discussions upon the Atonement. Of course, in questions which concern the expression of ideas common to the Greek and the Jew, an appeal to classical usage may be, and an appeal to those later writers such as Polybius and Plutarch who reflect the conversational language of their time, must be decisive. But the sacrificial conceptions of the Greeks were so utterly at variance with those of the Hebrews, that, when Jews of Palestine or Alexandria and Greeks of Athens or Ephesus made use of the same words, they meant things entirely different. To say that "the very words by which the sacrifice of Christ is described in the New Testament . . . are borrowed from the sacrificial ritual of the Greeks,"[1] is, to say the least, to ignore the fact of the introduction of new associa-

[1] Crawford, *The Doctrine of the Holy Scripture respecting the Atonement*, p. 100.

tions which invariably accompanies the process of translation. It was only by a gigantic accommodation that words which originally described heathenish rites, subsequently expressed in the hands of translators ideas remote from heathenism. One might as reasonably deduce the Homeric conceptions of sacrifice from the Christian associations of the English sacrificial terms in Lord Derby's translation, as endeavour to explain the Hellenistic words of the same class by a reference to classical usage. Undoubtedly the words of the Greek Testament are of Gentile extraction, but their significance is essentially Jewish; and those but repeat in a more subtle form the mistake of Tertullian and Ambrose in deriving paschal from *πάσχειν*, who interpret *ἱλαστήριον*, *λύτρον*, *καταλλαγή*, or *θυσία* from the usage of Homer, Xenophon, or Dion Chrysostom. Philological analogies to the New Testament sacrificial terms heathen writers may supply,—definitions, never. When the scriptural doctrine of the Atonement can be obtained by an etymological analysis of the English word *atone*, or a statement of its use in Shakespeare or in Chaucer, we may hope to infer the same doctrine from the Attic or Ionic use of such a word as *ἱλασμός*. The indispensable preliminary, we repeat, to an understanding of the biblical doctrine of the Atonement, is a knowledge of the significance of the words under which it is described, deduced from the language of Leviticus.

Another postulate must be stated. It has been the fertile result of recent researches to obtain a truer insight into the nature of the New Testament canon, by regarding the authors of its several constituent books as contributing not simply divine truth evidently bearing the impress of the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, but divine truth stamped as surely with the marks of human individuality. Instead of the passive theory of inspiration, in which, all natural and acquired powers of mind in abeyance, man became the irresponsive and unassisting channel of divine revelation, we have come to believe in a revelation to the imparting of which the mind of man and the Spirit of God both contributed. As a logical consequence, the recognition has gained ground of the existence of various (to use the word in the biological and not the theological sense) *types* of New Testament doctrine; and, as a

further consequence, equally natural it must be allowed, statements concerning the teaching of the New Testament are no longer proved by a string of texts promiscuously selected, but by the *consensus* of these *modifications* or *types*. It must therefore be our aim, by an examination of the several modifications of New Testament doctrine,—the examination taking the form of a comparison of the New Testament passages with those of the Old by means of the Septuagint,—to show that the work of Christ was regarded by Christ and His apostles, under many varieties of speech and figure drawn from the Mosaic worship, as sacrificial.

The fact has already been alluded to, that, at the first prophetic announcement of the near approach of the new religious epoch so long expected, John described Jesus as "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world." From Old Testament usage the meaning of this singular phrase is clear enough. The Baptist, himself a Jew and addressing Jews, described the future of this young man who had presented himself for baptism, by employing a common legal technicality about "bearing sins;" and all would understand his words to mean that in some way or other this "Lamb of God" should take away the sins of the world *by bearing their consequences*.[1] But what associations did the words, "the Lamb of God," arouse in the minds of the Jewish audience? Lambs, as has been frequently seen in the preceding book, were commonly employed in the Levitical ceremonial,

[1] John i. 29. The phrase is: Ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου. Much difficulty has been made concerning the significance of αἴρω, some translating it "take away," and others "bear." The precise translation adopted matters little, so long as the reference to the Levitical law is preserved. Αἴρω is the synonym of the Hebrew *nasa*, which, in connection with *avon* or *cheta*, always means the *taking away of sin by bearing its punishment*. As Knobel, *Leviticus*, p. 391, has tersely put it: "The expression *nasa avono*, to bear sin, especially in its strength and reality, *i.e.* to suffer its consequences, and thereby prevent its punishment from falling, has quite a general reference; it is used of any misfortune which God attaches to sin, such as childlessness, death, and the difficulties of Israel in the wilderness; it is also used of the capital punishment inflicted by men and of other criminal penalties. In Lev. v. 1 and elsewhere, the phrase is employed for the sacrifice by which atonement is made." See also Keil, *Biblischer Commentar*, Leviticus, on Lev. v. 1; also Lev. vii. 18, xvii. 16, xix. 8, 17, xx. 20, xxii. 9, xxiv. 15; Num. v. 31, ix. 13, xiv. 33, xviii. 22. Compare note 1, p. 218.

at the Passover, in the daily burnt-offerings, and in certain sin-offerings,—were all or any of these called before their minds by this astonishing admonition? Any reply must be based upon the fact that the description itself is in terms too general to warrant the assumption that any single rite is referred to; besides, no one sacrificial lamb more than another was considered by the Law as pre-eminently designed for the removal of sin. The truth is, John desired to suggest, "in a striking metaphor condensing the whole sacrificial system into a burning word,"[1] that Jesus would occupy in the future some such place as a lamb occupied in the past. Further, the connection between the antitypical lamb and the remission of sins would undoubtedly recall the famous prophecy of Isaiah, in which the lamb brought to the slaughter bears our sins,[2] is wounded for our sins,[3] bare the sins of many.[4] In one pregnant sentence John preached Christ as at once the fulfilment of the most eloquent features of the Jewish sacrifice, and of the highest imaginations of Jewish prophecy.

And, according to the testimony of the Gospels, our Lord Himself had recourse to the associations connected with the Old Testament ritual in order to convey vivid instruction concerning His stupendous work. We do not rely for the proof of this assertion upon the many covert illustrations which may be extracted from the discourses of our Lord, nor upon those suggestive words, so manifestly connected with the Temple services, which the fourth Gospel describes as having been spoken at Capernaum: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you:" we content ourselves with the proofs afforded by one striking assertion found in almost the same words in two of the synoptic Gospels, and by the words used by our Lord at the institution of the Lord's Supper. The assertion in question is, that "the Son of man came . . . to give His life *a ransom for many*."[5] The ambitious request of Salome, that her sons

[1] Reynolds, *John the Baptist*, Congregational Union Lecture for 1874, p. 371.

[2] Οὗτος τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει (Isa. liii. 4; compare ver. 6).

[3] Αὐτὸς δὲ ἐτραυματίσθη διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν.

[4] Καὶ αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκε.

[5] Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45: δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.

might hold the highest stations in the kingdom of God, had aroused an indignant protest on the part of the remaining disciples, and to quell the tumult Jesus had explained that by the law of the coming kingdom he should be lordliest who was lowliest, and his should be the coronet of highest glory whose had been the cross of most persistent duty; the Master had then clenched His exposition of the law of heavenly inheritance by adducing His own example, for even He who should be Lord in the kingdom of heaven came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to "give His life *a ransom for many*." This word *ransom* or *redemption* was familiar to every Jew. Under the Law, the method of commutation by the payment of a ransom was employed in all cases where things were due to God which from some ineligibility could not be themselves presented. Sometimes this *ransom* was a payment in money and sometimes in kind. The male first-born, who had been spared in Egypt, and whose lives were therefore forfeited to God, were "ransomed," "redeemed," by silver shekels; the first-born of unclean cattle, which were legally unqualified for sacrifice, were ransomed by the payment of their value or by the substitution of a clean animal. There were also instances of the ransoming of human lives under the Law; and when our Lord spoke of the ransoming the lives of many by a gift of life, His hearers would understand His words by the analogy of those national customs in which they had been born and bred. However difficult the application of Christ's words, and the comprehension of their mysterious suggestions, the meaning of them would be clear enough to the disciples. They would understand that there were many first-born whose lives would be spared because His life would be surrendered, or, as in the case of the man whose ox had gored a Hebrew to death,[1] there were many forfeited lives which should be restored, because His life should vicariously bear their punishment and be taken away.[2] The very word *ransom* or *redemption* (*lutron*) would recall a host of associations connected with the Mosaic idea of "redemption," —itself a conspicuous variety of bloodless sacrifices.

[1] Ex. xxi. 30.

[2] Compare Dale, *The Atonement*, Congregational Lecture for 1875, pp. 76, 77.

A further proof that our Lord deliberately associated His work with the Old Testament sacrifices, is found in the accounts of the institution of the Holy Eucharist. With slight variations, so trifling as to be unimportant in this connection, the three Synoptists represent our Lord as saying of the cup that it was "the blood of the covenant."[1] But these are the very words used by Moses at the sealing of the covenant of Sinai: "Behold the blood of the covenant."[2] The words of Christ Himself, therefore, at the first celebration of the great Christian sacrament, immediately recall that scene in the desert, when, in ratification of the first covenant, the great lawgiver sprinkled the blood of the sacrifices, half upon the altar and half upon the assembled multitude. If the first covenant had been sealed with the blood of oxen, the blood of Jesus was to seal the new. Without concerning ourselves at present with the further elucidation of these passages, or with their manifest reference to the prophecy of Jeremiah,[3] it is enough to draw attention to the evidence they afford that Jesus Himself described His death under a sacrificial aspect.

Turning to the apostolic testimony, it should surprise no one that direct mention is not made of the sacrifice of Christ either by James or Jude. The subject was foreign to the purpose with which they wrote. James felt it no part of his duty to explain what were the grounds of that "faith of our

[1] See Matt. xxvi. 28; Mark xiv. 24; Luke xxii. 20. In the Authorized Version Matthew has, *καὶ λαβὼν τὸ ποτήριον . . . τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου, τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης*; Mark has the same, with the omission of *γάρ* after *τοῦτο*; Luke has, *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον, ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου*. But, as might be anticipated from the fact that so important a narrative is found in more than one Gospel, considerable controversy has arisen as to the correctness of these readings. In Matthew, Tischendorf and Alford omit *τό*; Tischendorf omits *καινῆς*, whilst Alford marks it as doubtful. In Mark, Tischendorf and Alford omit both *τὸ* and *καινῆς*. Upon the words of Luke there is no difference of opinion. Referring to Tischendorf's *editio octava*, vol. i. pp. 180 and 374, for the data for the decision of these various readings, it would appear that there is a preponderance of evidence in favour of the reading in Matthew and Mark, *τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης* ("my blood of the covenant"); and in Luke, "the new covenant in my blood."

[2] Comp. Ex. xxiv. 8, where the LXX has *τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης*. Singularly enough, Alford, although he expressly mentions this passage in Exodus, explains the blood of the covenant by the blood of the paschal lamb.

[3] Jer. xxxi. 31–33.

Lord Jesus Christ"[1] of which he speaks, but to exhort by all manner of argument and illustration that that faith be no matter of the intellect, like that of "devils who believe and their hair stands on end,"[2] but living and vitalizing, the regenerating principle of heart and mind and will. James neither developes nor systematically treats of the doctrines of Christ and the Holy Spirit, still less does he touch upon that aspect of Christ's work to which the ancient sacrifices correspond; rather, taking for granted the common grounds of Christian obligation, does he dwell on bridling the tongue,[3] checking covetousness,[4] doing the law.[5] It is significant, however, that in his many references to the ancient Law he never once alludes to the duty of obeying the ritual injunctions: his silence would thus imply that the coming of the Lord had somehow fulfilled the purposes of the Jewish ceremonial, and had rendered that ceremonial obsolete. The same practical tendency is seen in Jude, who, nevertheless, somewhat significantly for the subject before us, advocates at the outset of his Epistle stern opposition to those false teachers who were followers of Cain, Balaam, and Core[6] (all of whom, be it noted, sinned in the matter of sacrificing), and did not adhere to the faith delivered to the saints once for all, and at the close utters his magnificent doxology: "To the only God, our Saviour, who can present us (as living sacrifices) without blemish (by no false, heathenish rites, but) through (that is to say, by the mediation of the great High Priest) Jesus Christ our Lord."[7]

In the Epistles of Peter, the utterances concerning the sacrificial nature of the work of Christ are seen at a glance. As the Israelites were chosen by God at Sinai to keep His covenant, and were sprinkled with blood in solemn ratification of their vows, so Peter designates his audience in the opening salutation of his first Epistle: "Elect unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus."[8] A little further on, in

[1] Jas. ii. 1. [2] Jas. ii. 19. [3] Jas. iii. 2. [4] Jas. v. 1.
[5] Jas. ii. 18. [6] Jude, ver. 11. [7] Jude, vv. 24, 25.

[8] 1 Pet. i. 2; compare Ex. xxiv. 8. Some have found the original of Peter's figure in the sprinkling of the blood of the Passover lamb, others in the sprinkling of the impure with water (see Num. xix. 7). The former opinion ignores the fact that the blood of the paschal lamb was sprinkled upon doorposts, not

his exhortation to those who are conscious of the privilege of adoption, to display in their approach to God due reverence and fear, Peter has recourse to the figure of the Passover lamb as an expressive form of describing the unparalleled obligations under which Christ has led His followers; he bids them "call to mind" that they were not "redeemed" from death, as was so often the case in the Law, "by corruptible things, by silver or gold," but, like the first-born, whose lives were spared by the destroying angel in Egypt, "with precious blood as of an immaculate and spotless lamb," even with the precious blood of Christ.[1] Further, in his apostolic exhortation to servants in the second chapter of the same Epistle, Peter adduces the example of Christ as worthy of imitation, Who did not return evil for evil, Who, "when He was reviled, reviled not again," but, as was prophesied by Isaiah, patiently "bore our sins" like the sacrificial victims of the past, and that too as on an altar, for He suffered "in His own body on the tree."[2] Elsewhere, speaking of the sufferings of Christ under the figure of a sin-offering, Peter writes of Christ as of Him "Who once suffered as a sin-offering, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God."[3] In his Second Epistle also

upon people; the latter forgets that the sprinkling of which Peter here speaks was with blood, not water.

[1] The author considers that the word "redeemed" conclusively points to the idea of redemption from death by the sprinkling of the paschal blood, but his argument does not require this specialization. If this passage, as many maintain, has but a general reference, like the announcement of John the Baptist, to any sacrificial lamb, the phrase being likewise suggested by the terms of Isaiah's famous prophecy, still there can be no doubt that Peter describes the work of Christ under language borrowed from the Old Testament worship. The blood of Christ is assuredly designated in this passage a *lutron*, and is as certainly likened to some sacrificial lamb, and this is enough for our argument. Huther's objection (Meyer, *Kritisch-Exegetisches Handbuch*, 3d ed. 1867, *in loco*) to the idea of a reference here to the paschal lamb, that its propounder (Hofmann, who has been followed by Alford) is mistaken in assuming that the paschal lamb had anything to do with the redemption from Egypt, is simply an *argumentum ad hominem*; the paschal lamb did "redeem," not from Egypt, it is true, but from death, and this is apparently the allusion here. This view is substantiated by the fact that all first-born sons, including those spared in Egypt, were redeemed under the Law "by corruptible things as silver and gold."

[2] 1 Pet. ii. 24; compare the Septuagint version of Isa. liii. 12. In vv. 23 and 25 of this same chapter, there are manifest references to Isa. liii. 5 and 7.

[3] 1 Pet. iii. 18. See Appendix I. B.

Peter has something to say of "the redemption with the precious blood of Christ," for he speaks enthusiastically of the Master who "bought" us in the world's great mart by the gift of His own life.[1]

Advancing from those Epistles, where the bent of the writers is the more evidently towards Old Testament aspects of truth, to those where the contrast between Judaism and Christianity is more pronounced, we see in the Epistles of Paul an equally undeniable assertion of the sacrificial nature of the death of Christ. Reviewing the Epistle to the Romans, the most systematic and thorough exposition of the gospel as it presented itself to the experience and thought of the apostle, it is evident that Paul alludes to the sacrifice of Jesus as the turning-point of his life and the basis of his teaching. After the opening salutation[2] and the passionate expression of his desire to preach the gospel even at Rome,[3] the apostle professes that he glories in this gospel, because it reveals to the believer that righteousness which is of divine character as well as origin;[4] "I am not ashamed," he writes, "of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; for therein is the righteousness of God revealed." He then proceeds to show, by an appeal to experience, that no such righteousness was visible either in the heathen, who possessed the law written in the conscience,[5] or in the Jew,[6] who possessed the objective Law. Having then shown, by an appeal to facts and also to passages in the Old Testament, that the righteousness God demanded had been nowhere visible in pre-Christian times, he goes on to say that "now the righteousness of God is manifested without the law, as is testified by the law and the prophets; that is to say, the righteousness of God which is by faith in Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference: for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; but are justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus."[7] In other words, the apostle writes that

[1] 2 Pet. ii. 1: τὸν ἀγοράσαντα.
[2] Rom. i. 1–7.
[3] Rom. i. 8–15.
[4] Rom. i. 17.
[5] Rom. i. 18–32, comp. ii. 15.
[6] Rom. ii.–iii. 20.
[7] Rom. iii. 21-26: διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

the righteousness the Old Testament ever demanded, but never wrought, is effected by faith in that divine exhibition of grace which is seen in the ransom paid by Christ. Now the important thing for us is, not to unfold the Pauline ideas of righteousness, grace, or faith, but that of redemption. What is this act which is designated *apolutrosis?* As we read further, it becomes evident that the apostle regards this act as in some way connected with the Old Testament sacrifices. Christ is, in his esteem, a Redeemer, because His blood is "an atoning sacrifice."[1] The word translated in the Authorized Version *propitiation* (better, as we have just said, *atoning sacrifice*) is used in the Septuagint to convey the distinguishing feature of the mercy-seat. A more conclusive argument could scarcely be found for our present thesis than this fact, that the blood of Christ is said to possess in the New Testament the same atoning characteristic as the mercy-seat in the Old. Other expressions may also be found in the same Epistle which substantiate the point before us. Thus the apostle several times speaks of Christ as a High Priest: he gives

[1] The word that has just been translated *atoning sacrifice*, ἱλαστήριον, is a neuter adjective used absolutely (compare Buttmann, *Gr. Grammatik*, 21st ed. vol. ii. p. 412). Its associations are with ἱλάσκομαι and ἐξιλάσομαι, the equivalent of the Hebrew *kipper*, and may be best translated, in order to preserve its connection with the Old Testament technically, by some form of the word *atone*. The word ἱλαστήριον is sometimes found in the LXX. without a corresponding noun, the word with which it tacitly agrees being sometimes ἐπίθεμα and sometimes θῦμα or ἱερόν. Hence two opinions have been advocated as to the significance of the word, the one maintaining ἱλαστήριον to mean *a place* of atonement, and the other an atoning *sacrifice*. On behalf of the former opinion there is the common usage of the LXX., where, with or without ἐπίθεμα, ἱλαστήριον stands for the mercy-seat; also the usage of the New Testament in one passage, Heb. ix. 5, and of Philo in one passage. Cremer, *Biblisch-Theologisches Wörterbuch der Neutestament. Gräcität* (translation published by T. & T. Clark), finds also in the analogy with ἀκροατήριον, δικαστήριον, καθιστήριον, a mark that ἱλαστήριον is a *nomen loci*. On the other hand, the context conclusively shows that, in this passage at any rate, ἱλαστήριον must agree with θῦμα (or some such word) understood; to say, "whom God hath set forth as a *place* of propitiation through faith in His blood," would be an inadmissible admixture of figures. And for such a significance the usage of later Greek writers (the word is never found in classical Greek) may be alleged—*e.g.*, Dion Chrysostom (Moses Stuart, *Commentary on the Romans*, p. 153), Nonnus, Hesychius, and Apollonius Rhodius (see Meyer, *Des Paulus Brief an die Römer, in loco*, 5th ed. p. 162). As to Cremer's argument, καθαρτήριον, χαριστήριον, and σωτήριον are instances where analogous words are assuredly not *nomina loci*.

thanks to God "*through* Jesus Christ;"[1] he says that God will judge the secrets of men under the gospel by Jesus Christ as He did by Aaron under the law;[2] he dwells upon the fact that Christ has obtained "access" into the holy mysteries.[3] Then it is "the blood of Christ" which, in the view of Paul, justifies us, an expression manifestly suggested by the atoning rites of the old covenant.[4] And collateral evidence may be found in each of the Pauline Epistles. Thus, the First Epistle to the Corinthians has supplied some of the most popular phrases for describing the sacrificial work of Christ; for, after speaking of the "cross of Christ" as the essence of the gospel,[5] and declaring that in the erection of a bodily temple to the Holy Ghost "other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, Christ Jesus."[6] Paul further describes the Lord as "Christ our Passover,"[7] and speaks of the believer's "communion in the blood of Christ."[8] So, in the Epistle to the Ephesians, there are numerous ascriptions of sacrificial epithets to the work of Christ; for example, the Old Testament idea of redemption is tersely spoken of as "the redemption through His blood;"[9] in another chapter Christ is said to have given Himself for us as "a sacrifice and an atoning sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour;"[10] and in yet another chapter the apostle glories in the "blood that brings near" and "the Priest by whom we have access."[11] The phrase

[1] Rom. i. 8. [2] Rom. ii. 16. [3] Rom. v. 2.
[4] Rom. v. 9. [5] 1 Cor. i. 17. [6] 1 Cor. iii. 11.
[7] 1 Cor. v. 7. [8] 1 Cor. x. 16.

[9] Eph. i. 7: *τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ.* Compare pp. 274, etc., on the idea of *ransom* or *redemption;* also Appendix I.

[10] Eph. v. 2. The phrase, *προσφορὰ καὶ θυσία,* is the Hellenistic equivalent of the common Hebrew phrase, *Tzevach uminchah.*

[11] Eph. ii. 13, 18. Harless, *Commentar über den Epheserbrief,* 2d ed., expounds Eph. v. 26, 27, according to the sacrificial ideas of Mosaism. This is a manifest error. The figurative allusion concerning Christ and His Church is taken from the bridal, and not the sacrificial ceremony. Harless has been misled by the word *λουτρόν,* which he regards as the laver, and by the word *ἄμωμος.* But *λουτήρ* and not *λουτρόν* is the word in the LXX. for the laver; and as for *ἄμωμος,* although it is frequently applied in the LXX. to sacrifices, its accompanying words *σπίλος* and *ῥυτίς* are quite foreign to the sacrificial phraseology. *Λουτρόν* is only found twice in the LXX., and both times in the Canticles. The figure throughout has to do with the bath and beauty of a bride, not with the purification and spotlessness of a sacred offering.

found in the Epistle to the Ephesians is repeated in that to the Colossians concerning "redemption, the forgiveness of sins," whether or not we add, with the Authorized Version, "through His blood."[1] To Timothy Paul writes of the "one mediator, the man Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom for all,"[2] thus combining in a single sentence the truths that Jesus of Nazareth was, like the high priest of old, the one mediator between God and man, and the sacrificial means of ransom for the entire race. To Titus, another youthful follower, the apostle speaks exultantly, under the combined figures of purification and redemption, of Him "Who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity and purify unto Himself (as the Old Testament rites had promised, but never performed) a peculiar people,[3] zealous of good works." May we not say, with the learned Dr. Pye Smith, that it would be "presumptuous and nugatory to attempt any addition to the strength and clearness of these testimonies"?

And the cogency of the proposition of this chapter, that the New Testament writers describe the work of Christ under the same language as the Mosaic sacrifices, is increased, when we turn from the Pauline to the Johannine type of doctrine. In the first part of his First Epistle, speaking upon the theme that God is light, John lays down the principle that those who walk in the light . . . "the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin:"[4] the allusion is manifestly to the rights of purification of the Levitical law, when, as in the case of the leprous, the taint of original sin was removed by a sacrifice of blood;

[1] Col. i. 14. Alford and Tischendorf omit διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, and the MSS. authority is unquestionably against the reading.

[2] 1 Tim. ii. 6: ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων. Compare pp. 274, etc., and Appendix I.

[3] Tit. ii. 14: λαὸν περιούσιον. Compare the same phrase in Ex. xix. 5 (LXX.); Deut. vii. 6, xiv. 2, xxvi. 18.

[4] 1 John i. 7: τὸ αἷμα Ἰησοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ καθαρίζει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας (MSS. authority is against the reading of the *Textus Receptus*: τὸ αἷμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). Some have interpreted this passage to signify the cleansing wrought by baptism; but the use of the present tense is sufficient refutation: the act to which John refers is going on synchronously with the walking in the light, the act is a continuous one. The allusion is not difficult to decipher. Καθαρίζω is the Hellenistic equivalent for *tihar*, the legal technicality for the rites of purification.

the Christian is, so to speak, a convalescent leper, and the blood of Jesus Christ daily cleanses him from all his former spots and diseases. In another passage of the same Epistle, John gives utterance to a second feature of Christ's work, and says He is "the atonement for our sins:"[1] "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be an atonement for our sins." It is but another expression for the same thought when the apostle repeats the words of John the Baptist, and says that Christ "was manifested that He might take away our sins by one great act."[2] The sacrificial ceremonies of purification and atonement also afford a clue to the significance of the singular passage which has so exercised the ingenuity of the commentators in all ages: "This is He that came by water and blood, Jesus Christ."[3]

Valuable materials for the proof of our present proposition are also to be gleaned from those battle-fields of New Testament interpretation, the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Book of the Revelation. From the Epistle to the Hebrews, the aim of which is to discover the analogies between the religions of the old and new covenants, the difficulty is to select. The words "blood"[4] and "high priest"[5] are perpetually recurring; they are the theme and refrain of this great didactic poem. Without entering upon the intricate argument of the Epistle, it may be said without fear of contradiction, that Jesus is described throughout as the antitypical high priest, who has obtained eternal redemption not by the blood of bulls and goats, or any insufficient and sacramentally efficacious offering, but by the gift once for all of His own precious life: "For Christ having appeared, a high priest of the good things to

[1] 1 John ii. 2, and iv. 10: *καὶ αὐτὸς ἱλασμός ἐστι περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν*; and *καὶ ἀπέστειλεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἱλασμὸν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν.* Ἱλασμός is the important word. It does not often occur in the LXX., but in one place it is the synonym of *asham* or trespass-offering, in another of *chattath* or sin-offering, in another of *kippurim* or atonement, and in two others of *selichah* or remission. Ἱλασμός is the verbal substantive of *ἱλάω*, and is thus nearly related to *ἱλάσκομαι* and *ἐξιλάομαι*, the Hellenistic equivalents of *kipper*. See Appendix I.

[2] 1 John iii. 5: *ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἄρῃ.* The aorist is emphatic.

[3] 1 John v. 6.

[4] Heb. ix. 11–14, 26, x. 5–10, 11–14, xii. 24, xiii. 10.

[5] Heb. ii. 17, iii. 1, iv. 14, vi. 20, vii. 16, vii. 24–28.

come, through the greater and more perfect Tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this creation, nor yet through the blood of goats and calves, but through His own blood, entered once for all into the Holy Place, and obtained eternal redemption for us." [1] So in the Book of the Revelation it is the sacrificial Lamb that occupies the prominent place. When the first glimpse is caught through the open door of the heavenly throne, encircled by its emerald rainbow, from out of which came lightnings and thunderings and voices, and before which rolled the sea of glass, lo! in the midst of the mysterious assembly stands the Lamb as it had been slain, and the song of creation, "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty," changes into the song of redemption, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain." [2] This same sacrificial Lamb is the centre of that antitypical Feast of Tabernacles, where all nations and kindreds and peoples and tongues, clothed in white robes and with palms in their hands, cry salvation to our God and unto the Lamb.[3] It is "the blood of the Lamb" that overcomes the accuser.[4] It is the "Lamb" that overcometh in the gigantic struggles with the powers of this world.[5] It is the "Lamb" that is the bridegroom of the white-robed church.[6] It is the "Lamb" whose throne eternally shines in the New Heaven.[7]

Gathering, therefore, into one the threads of the several phases of New Testament teaching which have been reviewed in this chapter, it may be said that the entrance of Christ upon His public ministry was heralded by a distinct announcement by the Baptist that His work would be in some sense sacrificial; then, that Christ Himself did not shrink from making the same claim for His life and death; and further, that, having regard to the apostolic testimonies, as far as they have been preserved in the New Testament, not only do those of the apostles whose bent lay towards Old Testament methods of presenting truth, but that even Paul and John, who dwell more emphatically upon the differences than the agreements between Judaism and Christianity, exhibit distinctly a sacri-

[1] Heb. ix. 11, 12. [2] Rev. iv. and v. [3] Rev. vii. 9.
[4] Rev. xii. 11. [5] Rev. xvii. 14. [6] Rev. xix. 7–9.
[7] Rev. xxii. 1–3.

ficial aspect of the work of Christ; that, in fact, not only portions, but the whole New Testament—not only the New Testament teaching, but any type of that teaching—must be cast aside unless the work of Christ be in some sense or other regarded as a sacrifice. As was said by Archbishop Magee: "They who would reject the notion of Christ's death as a true and real sacrifice for sin, must refine away the natural and direct meaning of (many New Testament) passages; or, in other words, they must new-model the entire tenor of Scripture language before they can accomplish their point." [1]

Thus the proposition that the atoning work of Christ is described in the New Testament in language borrowed from the Old Testament ritual, has been illustrated from a study of the several types of New Testament teaching.

[1] *Discourses on Sacrifice and Atonement*, Dissert. xxvii. Even Warburton, with all his rationalizing tendencies, *The Divine Legation of Moses*, Book IX. cap. ii., said: "One could hardly have thought it possible that any man who had read the Gospels with their best interpreters, the authors of the Epistles, should ever have entertained a doubt whether the death of Christ was a real sacrifice."

CHAPTER III.

THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT.

"Jesus, c'est-à-dire Sauveur . . . Comment est-il Sauveur? Par son sang. . . . Vous qui vous êtes scandalisés autrefois de voir couler le sang de mon maître, vous qui avez cru que sa mort violente était une marque de son impuissance, ah! que vous entendez peu ses mystères! La croix de mon roi, c'est son trône; la croix de mon pontife, c'est son autel. Cette chair dechirée, c'est la force et la vertue de mon roi; cette même chair dechirée, c'est la victime de mon pontife. Le sang de mon roi, c'est son pourpre; le sang de mon pontife, c'est sa consécration. Mon roi est installé, mon pontife est consacré par son sang; et c'est par ce moyen qu'il est le véritable Jesus, l'unique Sauveur des hommes."—BOSSUET, *Premier Sermon pour la Fête de la Circoncision.*

AS the result of the inquiry just concluded, it has been seen that the New Testament substantiates the proposition that the atoning work of Christ was in some sense sacrificial. There is the precedent of the entire New Testament for saying that, in some way as yet unexplained, the same language was applicable to the atoning work of Christ as to the prescribed offerings of the Jewish dispensation. The great question now is as to the nature of this resemblance in diversity, this common element in things apparently irreconcilable. What constituted the work of Christ a sacrifice?

The only course is to define terms. This may be done in two ways, by defining either subject or predicate. If we would know what the Scriptures imply when they describe the atoning work of Christ as sacrificial, the required knowledge would be obtained if we were aware either of what the Scriptures assert to be the atoning work of Christ, or of what the Scriptures regard as the equivalent sacrifice to the work of Christ.

The latter course is ineligible. The whole of the preceding book has been occupied with the significance of Old Testament sacrifice, and the most prominent results attained have been,

in the first place, quite a catalogue of diverse sacrifices; and, in the second place, the conviction that these diverse sacrifices, all the Patriarchal and Mosaic sacrifices of whatever kind, were but shadows of completer offerings which the future would reveal. With all the religious knowledge imparted by the sacrificial prescriptions of the Old Testament, with all the consolatory eloquence of the central doctrine of Sacrificial Atonement even, there was blended, as we have seen, so much of mystery and uninterpreted prophecy that these types and figures can scarcely be expected to afford the requisite clearness of reply. Manifestly, therefore, if we would know the meaning of the sacrifice of Jesus, turning from the inadequate portrayals of the past, the Redeemer's work itself must be discussed.

An answer is now desiderated to the question, What do the writers of the New Testament teach with respect to that work of the Lord Jesus which they designate by the sacrificial language of the Old Testament?

In accordance with the method everywhere pursued in this inquiry, a reply will be sought, first, by an examination of the several apostolic types of teaching; and, secondly, by an examination of the New Testament teaching as a whole.

Be it noted, however, that, in our analysis of the doctrinal statements of the several writers of the New Testament, we have not to do with the detailed and connected statement of the entire doctrinal system of any apostle;[1] we have not even to debate whether any such system can be reconstructed at the present day from the extant materials. Further, we have not to do with the individuality, the psychological bent and bearing, displayed by the apostles, influ-

[1] The reader who is curious upon this matter of apostolic doctrinal systems, may refer with advantage to the following works: upon the doctrinal system of Peter, to Weiss, *Lehrbuch der Petrinische Lehrbegriff*, 1855; on that of John, to Frommann, *Der Johanneische Lehrbegriff in seinem Verhältnisse zur gesammten biblisch-christlichen Lehre*, 1839; and on Paul, to the second volume of Reuss, *Histoire de la Théologie Chrétienne*, 3rd ed. 1864 (Eng. Trans. by Annie Harwood, and edited by R. W. Dale, 1874), where, the views of the author being much less tinged than usual with "critical" prepossessions, a valuable monograph will be found. Weiss, *Lehrbuch der Biblischen Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 5th ed. 1888 (translated in the *Foreign Theological Library*), portrays ably all the New Testament types of doctrine.

ence though it undoubtedly must their doctrinal systems. We have not to determine whether their style was classical or conversational, urban or provincial; the direct sententiousness of James, the fervid admonitions and consolatory experience of Peter, the emotional and logical vivacity, the interpretative self-portraiture of Paul, and the unruffled repose of John, are equally beside our investigation. Our task is to classify isolated thoughts and single turns of expression, so as to deduce the apostolic trains of thought upon the subject before us.

What, then, can we learn from the several types of teaching of the New Testament concerning the atoning work of Christ?

It is the characteristic of the Petrine teaching upon the atoning work of Christ, that it touches more especially upon the nature and effects of that work.

The order of thought in Peter's mind may be gathered from his First Epistle. The Christian life is a *salvation*, *σωτηρία*. Christ had been foreordained before the foundation of the world to obtain salvation for those who were foreknown as believers upon Him.[1] Of this salvation the prophets were aware by the revelations made by the Spirit concerning a suffering Messiah; but their knowledge had not, however, passed into experience.[2] Nevertheless, experimental knowledge is the privilege of all who, in these last times of divine revelation, believe.[3] If the question is asked, what this salvation is, the reply comes, that it is a salvation already revealed,[4] and a salvation ready to be revealed.[5] Of the salvation already revealed, Peter mentions two sides,—death to sin, and life to righteousness (otherwise expressed in reverse order as the "obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus"), meaning thereby the forgiveness of sins since Jesus has borne them,[6] and the ability to live a holy life.[7] Because of the one side, it may be said that, although in times past mercy had not been obtained, and the sinner had been confounded,[8] now, as by the blood of a lamb without

[1] 1 Pet. i. 2, 5, 9, comp. i. 20. [2] 1 Pet. i. 10, 11. [3] 1 Pet. i. 12, 21.

[4] 1 Pet. i. 9. Alford would make the salvation spoken of here something hereafter, "the great inclusive description of future blessedness." But the Epistle abundantly shows that salvation in Peter's view was something commenced here to be completed hereafter.

[5] 1 Pet. i. 5, 13. [6] 1 Pet. ii. 24. [7] 1 Pet. ii. 24. [8] 1 Pet. ii. 6.

blemish and without spot, mercy had been obtained as the first step to a better life.[1] In consequence of the other side, it is now no longer impossible to obey the divine command to "be holy;"[2] nor is it any longer a divine accommodation to speak, in the terms of the original covenant, of a holy priesthood, acceptable sacrifice, and a peculiar people.[3] The salvation ready to be revealed, which in Peter's view is the complete attainment of the salvation partly experienced in this present life, is sometimes called glory,—"the amaranthine wreath of glory;"[4] it is an inheritance incorruptible; it is the state of angels and of the risen Lord.

Thus far we have been dealing with the effects of Christ's work as deducible from the First Epistle. But Peter also speaks, albeit with more brevity, of the nature of that work which has accomplished salvation. That work was associated with the eternal foreknowledge of God the Father;[5] it was conditioned by the sinlessness of Christ;[6] it was a work of suffering;[7] the sufferings culminated in a death of the nature of a vicarious endurance of the sins of the unjust;[8] to that death succeeded a quickening of the spirit and a consequent resurrection to power, and glory, and dominion over angels, authorities, and powers.[9] Peter even slightly alludes to the necessity of the work of Christ arising from the "much mercy of God"[10] and that fallen state of man, who, living in darkness,[11] ignorantly followed his own lusts, and was subject unto death.[12]

The same doctrinal conceptions underlie the Second Epistle, although, as might be anticipated from its exclusively hortatory aim,—the Second Epistle is admonitory and hortatory, not hortatory and doctrinally illustrative, like the first,—they are nowhere so fully expounded. Nevertheless, we read in the Second Epistle of the necessity for the work of Christ which lay in the corruption that is in the world, as is instanced by lust,[13] that corruption being expanded and dilated upon in

[1] 1 Pet. i. 19. [2] 1 Pet. i. 16. [3] 1 Pet. ii. 5.
[4] 1 Pet. v. 4. [5] 1 Pet. i. 2. [6] 1 Pet. ii. 22, iii. 18.
[7] 1 Pet. i. 11, ii. 21, iii. 18, iv. 1, v. 1. [8] 1 Pet. ii. 24, iii. 18.
[9] 1 Pet. i. 3, 21, iii. 21, 22. [10] 1 Pet. i. 3. [11] 1 Pet. ii. 9.
[12] 1 Pet i. 14, 24, ii. 11, iv. 2. [13] 2 Pet. i. 4.

a passage [1] which, as a description of human depravity, is only paralleled by the first and third chapters of the Epistle to the Romans. Thus, the effects of Christ's work are described as "purification from former sins," [2] "escape from the miasmas of the world," [3] and as "entrance into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ;" [4] whilst the sources of this godly life and hope are stated to be "the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," [5] and that divine power of Christ [6] which enables us to be partakers of the divine nature.[7]

Substantially the same conceptions of the nature and effects of the atoning work of Christ pervade, under many forms of expression, the more numerous Epistles of Paul; but, whilst Paul nowhere exceeds or more lucidly represents the soteriologic aspects of Christ's work, his writings afford a more detailed account of the Godward, and especially the manward, aspects of that work, and hence bring into greater prominence the necessity for the work of Christ.

That necessity is declared by Paul to have had a triple origin,—in the attributes of the Father, in the attributes of the Son, and in the attributes of fallen man. The necessity, as regards the divine nature, lay in the allaying the divine anger, or wrath, or displeasure—that is to say, the divine righteousness developing itself as punishment for wrongdoing—aroused by human sin, and in the averting the consequences of that wrath, such consequences as "condemnation," the righteous judgment of God for a time restrained from its fury to be presently loosed with treasured force in indignation, in woe, in anguish, in flaming fire at the day of revelation.[8] Then, according to Paul, a further divine necessity for the work of Christ lay in that "love" [9] of God toward us, which is manifested in His grace.[10] The necessity in the attributes of Christ is but cursorily mentioned as His obedience.[11] But the apostle is very full in treating of the anthropological necessity

[1] 2 Pet. ii. 10–22. [2] 2 Pet. i. 9. [3] 2 Pet. ii. 20. [4] 2 Pet. i. 11.
[5] 2 Pet. i. 2: ἐπίγνωσις — *cognitio maturior, exactior*—the more exact and complete knowledge of Christ.
[6] 2 Pet. i. 16. [7] 2 Pet. i. 4.
[8] Rom. i. 17, ii. 3, 7, 8, v. 16, 18; Col. iii. 6; 2 Thess. i. 8, 9, 10.
[9] Rom. v. 7, viii. 39; Eph. ii. 4.
[10] Rom. iii. 24, iv. 16, v. 20, 21; Eph. ii. 5, 8. [11] Rom. v. 19.

for Christ's work. He sees a fertile source of evil and pain in the sin of man, which only such a power as that of Christ's can remove. Sin has a great crippling power; it renders our race powerless for good;[1] it generates a weakness to obey law;[2] it arouses a gigantic opposition between the ideal and real, since the sinner may know the right and choose the right, and yet be incapable of performing what he wills.[3] Darkness, unrighteousness, are the inevitable results.[4] Nor are the effects of sin appreciable in the inner realms of volition simply: the entire nature is tainted by it;[5] sin engenders impurity, lawlessness, concupiscence, even bestiality;[6] it forges the fetters of a bondage to the elements of the world,[7]—nay, in a word, it superinduces death,[8] mortality that is, and something more, misery, degradation, servility, moral impotence, eternal destruction.[9] A natural consequence, therefore, of sin is a mutual alienation of man from God,[10] and of God from man.[11] Nor is the catalogue of ills which must be removed, if man is ever to be restored, even yet complete. Man not only suffers from the effects of sin unconsciously, but consciously; a part of the sinner's lot is consciousness of sin; sometimes such a sense is a prompting of conscience, sometimes of the Law;[12] the soul knows itself to be without God in the world;[13] and ever and anon the consciousness of an awful punishment arouses despair.[14]

The nature of that work of Christ which is to change all this, and paint the ground colour of a brighter picture, is thus described by Paul. That work was the historical fulfilment of the eternal purpose of God "not to spare His own Son, but to deliver Him up for us all."[15] It was further conditioned by the fact that Jesus of Nazareth was both divine and human;

[1] Rom. v. 6. [2] Rom. viii. 3.
[3] Rom. vii. 18, 19. [4] Rom. i. 18, 21; Eph. iv. 18.
[5] Rom. vii. 18; Eph. iv. 22; Col. iii. 5.
[6] Rom. vi. 19, vii. 17; Eph. iv. 19; 1 Thess. iv. 5.
[7] Gal. iv. 3; Eph. ii. 2, 3.
[8] Rom. v. 17, vi. 16, 23, vii. 10, viii. 6, 12; Eph. ii. 2; Col. ii. 13.
[9] Rom. i. 24, 28, ii. 12, 16, vi. 16, vii. 14, 19, 24, viii. 10.
[10] Rom. viii. 7; Eph. iv. 18. [11] Rom. viii. 8. [12] Rom. ii. 12, 15, iii. 20.
[13] Eph. ii. 12. [14] Eph. ii. 3; Rom. i. 32, ii. 3, iii. 19.
[15] Eph. iii. 11; 2 Thess. ii. 13, 14; Titus i. 2; 2 Tim. i. 9, 10. Comp. 1 Thess. v. 9; 1 Cor. ii. 7.

for if, on the one side, the apostle speaks of the birth "according to the seed of David," he speaks of His being in an especial sense "God's own Son;"[1] if he brings before us the bodily resemblance to sinful humanity, he as clearly states that He had humbled Himself from the form of God;[2] if He was "born of a woman," He was also "the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation, because in Him the universe was created, things in the heavens and things in the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones, dominions, principalities, or powers, the whole universe has been created for Him and by Him, and He is before all things, and by Him the universe subsists."[3] Then, as prominent elements in the work itself, the apostle mentions our Lord's sinlessness,[4] His vicarious death,[5] and His glorious resurrection,[6] the main feature being the vicarious death "for us," "for our sins," "for ungodly men," "for all." It is indubitable that Paul regarded the work of Christ as centred in the crucifixion, when He, who was God in human form and sinless, submitted to death on behalf of sinful man.

Then, according to the thought of the apostle, great effects were wrought by this merciful work of Christ, both in heaven and on earth. By the work of Christ, God is at once just and the justifier of men;[7] He is the Saviour of all men,[8]—yea, a Father.[9] His eternal power may now uninterruptedly flow. He can raise His Son from the dead, He can exalt Him, He can Himself become the Deliverer of man from the dispiriting opposition between the flesh and the spirit.[10] Indeed, the foreknowledge of this work of the Lord had prompted the predestination of man to be conformed to the image of His Son;[11] and, in actual fact, the Lord God Almighty becomes the source to mankind of wisdom and righteousness, sanctification and redemption.[12] Man can now be reconciled to

[1] Rom. i. 4, comp. viii. 3, xv. 6; 2 Cor. i. 19, xi. 31; Gal. iv. 4.
[2] Rom. viii. 3. Comp. Phil. ii. 6, 7; Eph. ii. 8; Col. i. 21, 22.
[3] Gal. iv. 4. Comp. Col. i. 15–17.
[4] 2 Cor. v. 20; Rom. v. 19.
[5] Rom. v. 6, 8; 1 Cor. xv. 3; 2 Cor. v. 14; 1 Thess. v. 10.
[6] Rom. viii. 11; Col. ii. 12; 1 Thess. i. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 8.
[7] Rom. iii. 26, viii. 34.
[8] 1 Tim. iv. 10; Titus iii. 4.
[9] 2 Cor. vi. 18.
[10] Rom. vii. 25.
[11] Rom. viii. 29; Eph. i. 3, 4, 5, 11.
[12] 1 Cor. i. 30.

Himself;[1] he can be delivered from the grave;[2] he can be blessed with the gift of everlasting consolation, with a good hope through grace;[3] the believer can receive all things.[4] The work of Christ also redounded to His personal glory. A life unto God is the life of the risen Jesus,[5] a life of intercession at God's right hand.[6] He has "made peace."[7] By His holy life He has condemned sin in the flesh,[8] and become the Judge of the quick and the dead.[9] It is His to bestow the gift of His Spirit[10]—the grace of God.[11] He is the agent in the deliverance of man from the paralyzing conflicts between the higher and lower natures.[12] He, indeed, is the channel, if the Father is the source, of wisdom and righteousness, sanctification and redemption.[13] Henceforth it is His to impart "unsearchable riches."[14] But again it is on the anthropologic side that Paul is fullest; he describes at considerable length the effects wrought upon man by the work of the Lord Jesus. For the believer, punishment is no more; sin is no more imputed; there is now no condemnation; man is justified; by one deed and at one time man has been freed from the law of sin and death; salvation has been granted from "the wrath," present or to come.[15] The very consciousness of sin is allayed in the human heart; for has not the sinner peace with God, reconciliation, justification, forgiveness of sins?[16] Is he not redeemed from the curse of the Law?[17] Further, the apostle describes how, that the deliverance may be complete, to rest of conscience there is added strength of character, and glories in the gospel that the power as well as the guilt of sin is removed; thus, the soul that is forgiven is spiritually quickened,[18] there is a newness of life,[19] a service in newness of the Spirit,[20] a life in the Spirit.[21] This life in the Spirit is a death to sin,[22] a slaying of the deeds of the body.[23] Other

[1] 2 Cor. v. 18, 19. [2] 1 Cor. xv. 57. [3] 2 Thess. ii. 16. [4] Rom. viii. 32.
[5] Rom. vi. 10. [6] Rom. viii. 33. [7] Col. i. 20. [8] Rom. viii. 3.
[9] 2 Tim. iv. 1. [10] Rom. viii. 11. [11] 1 Cor. i. 4. [12] Rom. vii. 25.
[13] 1 Cor. i. 30. [14] Eph. iii. 8.
[15] Rom. iii. 28, iv. 8, 27, v. 9, v. 18, viii. 1, 2. Comp. 1 Thess. i. 10.
[16] Rom. v. 1; Phil. iv. 7; Rom. v. 1, 11, 19; 2 Cor. v. 21; Gal. ii. 16; Col. i. 4.
[17] Gal. iii. 13. [18] Rom. viii. 11; Eph. ii. 5; Col. ii. 13.
[19] Rom. vi. 4; Eph. iv. 24; Col. iii. 10.
[20] Rom. vii. 6; Titus iii. 5. [21] Gal. v. 25.
[22] Rom. vi. 2; Gal. ii. 20; Col. ii. 20, iii. 3. [3] Rom. viii. 13.

inevitable consequences are sanctification,[1] life and peace,[2] a preservation blameless,[3] righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost,[4] a manifestation of the life of Jesus.[5] So also it may be said that this new life is a life with Christ, in which the entire man, being filled with all the fulness of God, becomes a very temple of God.[6] Nor are the blessings of salvation exhausted by the forgiveness of sins, the quieting of conscience, and a renewal of life; the apostle also speaks of a present hope and a future realization of the glory of God.[7] As a free gift the believer shall have a life eternal,[8] and shall participate in Christ's glory;[9] he is, in fact, already sealed unto the day of redemption:[10] for every believer there shall be a resurrection from the dead,[11] and a reign in life.[12]

Before passing on to the Johannine views upon the matter in hand, a glance may be profitably cast at the Epistle to the Hebrews. Its conceptions upon the work of Christ are essentially Pauline. It was by "the grace of God" that Jesus tasted death for every man;[13] and that death received its validity and power, on the one hand, because the historical Jesus was the Son of the Most High—the very radiance of the divine glory and the impress of the divine character;[14] and on the other hand, because He had suffered,[15] was sinless throughout,[16] and had become perfect through sufferings.[17] Then the effects said to be wrought by this suffering and death are, first, that He is Himself crowned with glory and honour,[18] has passed into the heaven,[19] and become the High Priest who ever liveth to make intercession,[20]—that, in fact, He is the author and the finisher of our faith;[21] and, secondly, since He has wrought reconciliation for sins,[22] the believer can receive eternal salvation—salvation to the uttermost,[23] that is to say, sanctification in this life[24] and entrance into rest in the life to come.[25] In fact,

[1] Rom. vi. 12. [2] Rom. viii. 6. [3] 1 Thess. v. 23.
[4] Rom. xiv. 17. [5] 2 Cor. iv. 10.
[6] Rom. vi. 8; Gal. ii. 20; Col. iii. 3; Eph. iii. 19; 1 Cor. iii. 17, vi. 19.
[7] Rom. v. 2; Col. i. 27, iii. 4. [8] Rom. v. 20, vi. 23.
[9] Rom. viii. 18; Col. i. 12; 1 Thess. iv. 14. [10] Eph. iv. 30.
[11] 1 Cor. xv. 12-23, 57; 2 Cor. iv. 13; Phil. iii. 21.
[12] Rom. v. 17; Eph. ii. 6. [13] Heb. ii. 9. [14] Heb. i. 3.
[15] Heb. ii. 17. [16] Heb. iv. 15. [17] Heb. ii. 10. [18] Heb. ii. 9, xii. 2.
[19] Heb. iv. 14. [20] Heb. vii. 25. [21] Heb. xii. 2. [22] Heb. ii. 17.
[23] Heb. v. 29, vii. 25. [24] Heb. x. 14. [25] Heb. iv. 8-10.

the opening chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews becomes, by its Christologic sentiments, a transition to the teaching of John.

Turning to the Johannine exposition of the atoning work of Christ, it is evident that whilst the exposition exhibits the same general substratum of doctrine as that which underlies the writings of Peter and Paul, it was also the privilege of John to bring into more especial prominence one feature of Christ's work which is but cursorily alluded to by the other New Testament writers. As Peter dwelt more emphatically upon the soteriologic aspect, and Paul upon the anthropologic aspect, John unfolded with greatest clearness and detail the Christologic side of Christ's work. The Johannine cast of thought may be gained with tolerable precision from the First Epistle of John, and the several elucidatory remarks of his Gospel, especially its introduction. In the necessity for the work of Christ, John, like Paul, sees a human and a divine side; this human necessity lying in the "unrighteousness"[1] and consequent "darkness"[2] in which man was sunk, and in that love of the world — that lust of the flesh and of the eyes[3]—in which he was absorbed; this divine necessity consisting in the "holiness,"[4] and especially the "love,"[5] of God. The nature of Christ's work John describes as being seen, in the historical manifestation of Christ, in His sinless[6] bearing of the curse of human sin[7] by submitting to the punishment of death,[8] thus becoming the *atonement* for the sins of the whole world.[9] Of the effects of the work of Christ, John speaks generally as the imparting of "life,"[10] or the restoration to the privileges of the Divine Fatherhood;[11] and, more specifically, as consisting, in the first place, of forgiveness of sins, and therefore of boldness in the day of judgment;[12] and, in the second place, of a cleansing from all unrighteousness by an unction from the Holy One,[13] this purification showing itself throughout the range of Christian morality, but especially in the absence of "hate" and the presence of "love;" and,

[1] 1 John i. 9. [2] 1 John i. 17. [3] 1 John ii. 15–17.
[4] 1 John i. 5. [5] 1 John iii. 1, iv. 9, 16. [6] 1 John ii. 1, 29, iii. 5.
[7] 1 John iii. 16. [8] 1 John iii. 16. [9] 1 John ii. 2.
[10] 1 John v. 12. [11] 1 John iii. 1, 7. [12] 1 John iv. 17.
[13] 1 John ii. 10.

in the third place, of "eternal life," the "not being ashamed at His coming,"[1] the "being like Him," the "seeing Him as He is."[2] But John does not dwell simply upon the work of Christ during His earthly ministry, nor does he rest content with a statement such as Peter's concerning the pre-existence of Christ; he adds an important element to our doctrinal conception of the scheme of salvation, by expounding at some length the status of the pre-existent Christ, and the peculiar efficacy thus attached to any atoning work He might undertake. This necessary complement to the previously cited types of doctrine is the doctrine of the Logos. According to John, He who enables believers upon His name to become sons of God is the Word, Who is God, Who was in the beginning with God, Who was Creator of all things, Who possessed life in Himself and was the source of all light, Who became flesh, Who diffused His gracious and true glory, Who displayed eternal life, Who declared Himself to the apostles that they might declare through Him fellowship with the Father, Who has now returned to the bosom of the Father.[3] By this clear and consistent teaching of the divinity of Jesus, the apostolic testimony to the work of Christ was made complete. Needs it be stated that the "Alpha and Omega" of the Revelation finds its parallel only in the advanced doctrine of the Epistle and Gospel of John?

It is scarcely necessary to add, that all the doctrinal features of these several types are found in the discourses of our Lord Himself. Who amongst the apostles dwelt so fully, by word and act, upon the necessity for intervention which lay in the justice and love of the Father? Who spoke so forcibly as He upon that necessity which lay in the sinful condition of man? Who revealed so plainly the nature of that salvation which He Himself wrought, at once the eternal Son of the Father and the suffering Son of Mary? Who told like Himself, even so early in the public ministry as the conversation with Nicodemus, the wonders which His death should effect? Who so beautifully exhibited those present results of His work, to be seen in regained peace of mind and restored sonship, or those future results which would be experienced

[1] John iii. 2. [2] 1 John iii. 2. [3] John i. 1–19; 1 John i. 1, 18.

when the soul had reached the "many mansions"? In the parables of Jesus, in His esoteric and exoteric conversations, every element may be found of that teaching which afterwards became popularized by the labours and writings of the apostles.

It will have become evident to any attentive and critical reader of the preceding analyses, that the New Testament does not afford diverse answers to the question concerning the work of Christ, although those answers are stamped with an individuality which renders them different. The several types of New Testament teaching supplement, but do not supplant each other.

Indeed, it may be well to briefly recapitulate the result of questioning the several New Testament types. The leading result is this, that the entire apostolic testimony would evidently display the anomaly of inference without a single substantiating premise, if the death of Christ were left out of account. The Petrine soteriology is a doctrine of salvation *through the death of Christ*. The Pauline anthropology is a doctrine of the rise and progress of fallen man which had its primary impetus *in the death of Christ*. The Christology of John has its climax when the *blood was spilt* which cleanses from all sin. Or, not to dwell upon what has become abundantly evident already, if the apostolic testimony be regarded, it was *the death of Christ* which reconciled the opponent attributes of the Father; it was *the death of Christ* which became the starting-point of the palliation of the consequences of sin in humanity; it was *the death of Christ* which gave a reasonable ground for a new hope for the human race; it was *the death of Christ* which was the irrevocable preliminary to a restoration of any semblance of the paradisaic intercourse between the estranged Creator and the creature. Take away the death of Christ, and the apostolic gospel is a baseless announcement.

It therefore now becomes our duty to rise if possible to *a higher stage of generalization*, and place in *one consistent and interdependent view* the several apostolic testimonies just elicited.

Examining, then, the entire extant testimony of the apostolic

age as a whole, the same grand result immediately declares itself. The New Testament as a whole demonstrates that the death of Jesus had atoning value, that is, rendered the divine indignation against sin inoperative,—made possible the divine forgiveness of sin, and the cure of the effects of sin.

For, according to the teaching of the New Testament as a whole, there are five propositions concerning the death of Christ which are again and again repeated:—

First, it is declared that the death of Christ is not of small concern as compared with His life.[1]

Secondly, it is declared that the death of Christ is in some way a death for the human race.[2]

Thirdly, the New Testament also declares that the death of Christ is in some way a death for the sin of the human race.[3]

Fourthly, the New Testament further declares that the death of Christ in some way obtains the forgiveness of the sins of the human race.[4]

Fifthly, the New Testament as surely declares that the death of Christ in some way neutralizes the effects of the sins of the human race.[5]

Summarizing, further, the entire trend of this New Testament teaching, it may be said that, according to the New Testament, *salvation is rendered possible by the death of Christ.*[6]

[1] Matt. xx. 28; Luke xxii. 19, 20; John vi. 51, x. 11, 15, 18, xv. 12, 13; Acts xx. 28; Rom. iii. 25, v. 6–10; 2 Cor. v. 14, 15; Gal. ii. 20; Eph. i. 6, 7, ii. 16; Col. i. 13, 14; 1 Thess. v. 9, 10; Heb. ii. 9, ix. 12, 15, 27, 28, x. 10–14, xiii. 12; 1 Pet. i. 18, 19, ii. 24, iii. 18; 1 John iii. 16; Rev. i. 5, 6, v. 9, vii. 14.

[2] Matt. xx. 28; Luke xx. 19, 20; John vi. 51, x. 11, 15, 18, xv. 12, 13; Rom. v. 6–8, viii. 32; 1 Cor. v. 7; 2 Cor. v. 14, 15, 21; Gal. ii. 20, iii. 13; Eph. v. 2, 25; 1 Thess. v. 9, 10; 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6; Titus ii. 13, 14; Heb. ii. 9, x. 11–14; 1 Pet. iii. 18; 1 John iii. 16.

[3] John i. 29; Rom. iv. 25, v. 20, 21, viii. 3; 1 Cor. xv. 3; 2 Cor. v. 21; Gal. i. 4, iii. 13; Heb. ii. 17, ix. 26, 27, 28, x. 11–14; 1 Pet. iii. 18; 1 John ii. 2, iv. 10.

[4] Matt. xxvi. 28; Luke xxiv. 46, 47; John i. 29, iii. 14–17; Acts x. 43, xiii. 38, 39; Rom. iii. 24–26; 1 Cor. i. 30; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19; Eph. i. 6, 7, ii. 16; Col. i. 13, 14; Heb. ix. 26, 27, 28; 1 John i. 7, ii. 2, iv. 10; Rev. i. 5, 6.

[5] John iii. 14–17; Rom. v. 8, 9, vi. 10, 11; 1 Cor. i. 30; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19; Eph. ii. 16; 1 Thess. v. 9, 10; Heb. x. 10, xiii. 12; 1 John i. 7; Rev. i. 5, 6.

[6] Luke xxii. 19, 20; John i. 29, v. 53, x. 14–18; Acts xx. 28; Rom. iii. 24, 25, v. 6–10; 1 Cor. v. 7, xv. 3; 2 Cor. v. 14, 15; Gal. iii. 13, 14; Eph. i. 7, ii. 13–16; 1 Thess. v. 9, 10; Heb. ii. 9, ix. 11, 12, 26, x. 10, 12, 14, 19; 1 Pet. i. 18, 19, ii. 24, iii. 18; 1 John i. 7; Rev. i. 5, v. 9, vii. 14.

But, as yet, we have got but a small way in our examination of the New Testament teaching as a whole concerning this unique death of Jesus. For thus far it has only been shown that the New Testament teaches that it was the death of the God-man which first rendered possible the divine forgiveness and cure of sin. Now, important as this fact is, it but brings us to the threshold of our inquiry. *It is further necessary to inquire what more the New Testament teaches concerning the atoning death of Jesus.*

The New Testament teaches much more. Indeed, *the New Testament doctrine concerning the Atonement* by the death of Christ *divides itself into five parts*, viz. the doctrine concerning the *necessity* of atonement (why Christ must die), the doctrine concerning the *nature* of atonement (what atonement is), the doctrine concerning the *object* of atonement (what it does), the doctrine concerning the *mode of working* of the death of Jesus (how it acted), and the doctrine concerning the *extent* of the influence of the atonement (for whom Christ died). All these aspects of the one doctrine of atonement by the death of Jesus have now to be arranged as far as possible in clear and consecutive order. A remarkable self-consistency will appear in them all.

First, then, *on the* NECESSITY FOR THE ATONEMENT.

The New Testament sees *a threefold necessity* for Christ's atoning death, viz. in the sin of man, in the nature of God, and in the relation of Jesus to God and man.

The necessity for the death of Christ appears first in time at the Fall of man. When Adam ceased to render his sacrifice of obedience, the relations between himself and his Maker changed, change showing itself in the action of the Father, in the action of the Son, and in the nature and action of man.

One part of the necessity for the atoning work of Christ, as stated in the New Testament, *lay in the attributes of God. The death of Christ was necessitated by the nature of God, that is to say, by the divine holiness,*[1] *which declares itself in intense moral indignation against sin, and by the divine love,*[2] *which shows itself in intense affection towards the sinner.*

[1] Rom. i. 17, vii. 25, 26; Eph. ii. 3; Col. iii. 6; 1 Thess. v. 9; Rev. xix. 5.
[2] John iii. 16; 1 John iv. 10; 2 Thess. ii. 16.

God was righteous; and the righteousness which showed itself to man unfallen as fellowship, upon fallen man displayed itself as "wrath." This "wrath" worked passively by distance, and actively by punishment. The Ruler of all must be holy. If He be not holy, He is not God. Justifier He may be of the transgressor in His mercy; just He must be even in His justifying. The closing of Eden speaks of the divine withdrawal from fellowship with sin; the punishments which had befallen and still threatened the human race speak also of the vindicative anger of the All-righteous One; and more sure and terrible than all, the mysterious decree of death, suggestive of we know not what evil, impended ever as the divine sentence upon sin. "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty," is the silent doxology of every fact that speaks to man, by divine ordinance, of his altered state. "Christ Jesus, whom God purposed to be an atoning sacrifice, through faith, by His blood, to show His righteousness, because of the prætermission of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God; for the showing, I say, of His righteousness at this present season, that he might Himself be righteous and give righteousness to him that hath faith in Jesus."[1]

But God is love: love is the very essence of the divine character; all love and righteousness before sin, God is all love and righteousness after sin, notwithstanding that His righteousness is a righteous indignation. As great a necessity for the atoning work of Christ lay, therefore,—so the New Testament asserts,—in the divine love as in the divine wrath. Nor is there any contradiction in this, unless we perplex ourselves by inapplicable human analogies. Instinctive human love, carrying evidence of its unholiness in its desire for unconditional forgiveness, can never help us to understand the cross of Christ. Holy love knows nothing of unconditional forgiveness; its supreme concern is to harmonize the rival claims of right and inclination. God is holy; God is love. "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the atoning sacrifice for our sins."[2]

In these two scriptural statements lies part of the necessity

[1] Rom. iii. 25, 26. [2] 1 John iv. 10.

for the atoning death of Christ; for if God is love, His love calls for some means of saving man; and if God is holy, that means cannot be unconditional forgiveness. To uphold the divine righteousness, and at the same time to remove the difficulties which restrain the exercise of the divine love; this is the problem introduced by the Fall.

Another part of the necessity of the atoning work of Christ, recognised by the New Testament, *lay in the fallen nature of man*,[1] or, more precisely, *in the conscious and unconscious effects of sin. Those effects pertained to sin as transgression, and to sin as depravity.*[2] "Now once at the consummation of the ages, hath He been manifested to put away sin by His sacrifice."[3] "As through one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, . . . even so through one act of righteousness the free gift came unto all men to justification of life."[4]

And first of depravity. By the primary act of disobedience, the current of divine influence, which had ceaselessly flowed from God from the hour of creation, was stopped; the balance of the human faculties, so exquisitely made and so delicately adjusted, was disturbed; and he who was before half God and half animal, gravitated beyond all power of righting himself. With oscillation came disorder and unrest. This loss of balance was the fertile root of all those diseases, physical and psychical, which culminated in death. Life had become, in fact, a living death. The mysterious fact of generation was also implicated, the perturbation of the parents being transmitted to their children. Not that the original likeness to God was entirely obliterated; for, in the sense of right and in the consciousness of God, traces remained of the primeval experiences. Yet these very relics of the felicitous past brought their discomforts, since, on the one hand, they made life a wearing conflict between intention and action, the ideal and the real; and, on the other hand, the primary causes of

[1] Rom. v. 6, 12, 18, viii. 3; Gal. i. 4; Titus ii. 13, 14; 1 Pet. iii. 18; Heb. ix. 26.

[2] Compare Sheldrake, *Medium Theory of the Atonement*, Nashville, Tennessee, 1888.

[3] Heb. ix. 26.

[4] Rom. v. 12, 18.

evil persisting, they themselves tended to fade from the spirit like some beautiful poem forgotten in drowsiness. *Facilis descensus Averni,*—one glides with the stream without effort. The will of man fell in with the course he was almost imperceptibly following, and unconscious error became conscious sin.

Add to the effects of sin as depravity, its effects as transgression. Ever and anon, the sense of merited punishment for wrongdoing arose from the depths of the spirit, prompting despair, and with the loss of self-respect, further sin.

If man was ever to be restored from the blinding and corrupting effects of sin, if he was ever to be delivered from the oppressive dictates of his conscience, some means must be discovered by which the painful consequences of the past might be neutralized, the lost balance restored, the voluntary choice of good ensured, and, as a preliminary to all, the dead conscience aroused and tranquillized. All would be easy if the power which created could revive, if the voice which condemned could reprieve.

And yet again, according to the New Testament, *the atoning death of Christ was necessitated by the relation of the God-man to God and man. For not only does Christ love*[1] *man, but He loved him from eternity; and not only is Christ interested in man, but, as his Creator and as the Word made flesh, He sustains a very peculiar relationship to man. Indeed, the Eternal Word is at once the Mediator between God and man,*[2] *and the Archetype of man*[3] *both as created and redeemed.* For, according to the New Testament, Jesus, who was the God-man, acted in His pre-existent state with the Father and the Holy Spirit, and always in a definite relation. It was the office of the Eternal Word to act as Mediator. In all divine acts each Person in the Blessed Trinity is represented as co-operating, but their acts are not interchangeable. The Eternal Word is ever the Mediator between God and man. "The Son of His love, in whom we have our redemption, the forgiveness of our sins, who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation; for in Him were all things created, in the heavens

[1] Rom. viii. 37; Gal. ii. 20; Rev. i. 5. [2] 1 Cor. viii. 6; Col. i. 14–18.
[3] Gen. i. 27; comp. Col. i. 15; Rom. viii. 29.

and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through Him and unto Him; and He is before all things; and in Him all things hold together: and He is the head of the body, the Church; who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead, that among all He might have the pre-eminence."[1]

In the nature, then, of the God-man, and in His relation to God and man, lie the reasons for the part taken by Jesus, the Word incarnate, in atonement. For He it was who had crowned the glorious edifice of creation by forming man in His own image. That image He saw defaced, if not effaced. God's grandest work on earth stood, He saw, like a vacated temple, or a dead genius. It was not alone that man had transferred his allegiance; the transfer involved *sure* destruction. If the work of divine revelation, which was the office of the Word, if the expression of the innermost thought of the Father, was to be effected without a flaw, some great regenerative process must be undertaken by the Son. Further, it was His to give adequate expression before man to the holiness and love of the Father.

Second, on the NATURE OF THE ATONEMENT.

How all these antinomies, introduced by sin, have been reconciled, — how the divine righteousness is silenced and satisfied, how the divine love is enabled once more to flow freely, how man is forgiven, how the old Adam is slain and the new implanted, how the Son becomes again the channel of a new birth and a more glorious creation,—all these things are evident as we further proceed to study the New Testament statements as to the nature of the atoning work of Christ.

Let it be remarked, however, that we are not concerned with the eternal purpose of God as such, but with the unfolding of those purposes in time. The New Testament assures us that the Divine Father, foreseeing before all worlds the fall of man, foresaw and pre-arranged the redemption by the Son; and that God the Son, knowing before all worlds the loving purpose of the Father, rendered a cheerful acquiescence. It is with that acquiescence, as revealed to man in the realm of

[1] Col. i. 14–18.

the successive, not as apprehended by the Eternal Mind, that we have at the moment to do.

In passing to the nature of the atoning death of Christ, as taught in the New Testament, *a series of statements present themselves.*

For example, Christ suffered, it is said, for sins. *His death was a suffering for sin.* "For," writes Paul, "I delivered unto you, first of all, that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins." [1]

Further, in suffering for sins, our Lord willed to suffer. *His suffering was voluntary.* As the theologians say, He displayed active as well as passive obedience. "Therefore doth the Father love me," said Jesus Himself, "because I lay down my life, that I may take it again: no one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself." [2]

Further, in suffering, *Jesus suffered as the God-man.* For Jesus was the God-man. "Have this mind in you," writes Paul to the Philippians, "which was also in Christ Jesus, who, being originally in the form of God, counted it not a thing to be grasped to be on an equality with God, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a bond-servant, becoming in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, becoming obedient unto death, yea, the death of the cross."

Not that it is any part of our labours to gather into array all the testimonies of the New Testament, direct and indirect, to the unique character of Jesus. It has been already seen in our classification of the apostolic statements concerning the work of Christ, that, whilst all those statements fundamentally agree, they differ in the detail and prominence which they assign to certain aspects of their doctrine. The same is true concerning the doctrine of the Person of Jesus; there is not a modification of New Testament teaching from which that doctrine may not be deduced. The doctrine of the blended divinity and humanity of Jesus may be found in the somewhat Judaic type of teaching of the Synoptists, James, Jude, and Peter: it may be found much more distinctly in the Pauline

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 3; Heb. x. 10; 1 Pet. iii. 18.
[2] John x. 17, 18; Rom. v. 19; Phil. ii. 8.

type of doctrine, and most precisely of all in that type of teaching which is designated Johannine. The detailed proof of these assertions it is unnecessary as well as inappropriate for us to give, inasmuch as that proof has been so ably and conclusively educed by an author, the value of whose contributions to Christology are universally acknowledged.[1] We merely add that any additional proof that may be necessary of the *consensus* of apostolic testimony upon the Person of Christ will be taken for granted. Jesus of Nazareth was truly God. He is expressly designated divine; all divine names and titles are applied to Him; all divine attributes are ascribed to Him, He is declared to be omniscient, omnipresent, omnipotent, eternal, unchangeable; divine works are ascribed to Him, such as creation, new creation, salvation, resurrection, judgment. His was a pre-existent life before all worlds and all creatures. He expressly claimed equality with God. He is frequently called the Son of God, the only-begotten of the Father. He is mentioned as one of the Divine Trinity. He is the object of worship for men and angels. He is the object of faith, reverence, love, homage, devotion, invocation, supplication, thanksgiving. Jesus of Nazareth was truly man. He is said to have assumed human form. He is called an Israelite, a son of David; He is said to have been born of a woman. He possessed a human body. All the characteristics of this mortal life were visible in Him; He was limited by time and space, He could hunger and thirst, He was susceptible of weariness, He could pray, He could weep, He could be tempted and tried, a disciple could lean upon His bosom. He was born, He died, He was buried, He was crucified. He calls Himself the Son of man; He called men His brethren; others called Him man, He showed a filial solicitude and affection for Mary.

Again, as the God-man, born under special conditions, *Jesus had no sins of His own for which to suffer*. It is the unanimous testimony of the New Testament, that Jesus of

[1] Professor Dorner is of course meant. In the introduction to his great work, *Entwickelungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi* (ably translated into English by Drs. Alexander and Simon), the *Biblico-Theological* proof is exhaustively given.

Nazareth, being born under abnormal conditions, did not share in the normal human state of inherited weakness, and that having lived under abnormal conditions, He had neither part nor lot in the conscious and wilful wrongdoing of the race. His was a sinless life of uninterrupted communion with the Father. When the sun was hot He could walk with God, and no fear seized Him in the cool of the day as He heard the voice of God amongst the trees. He Who was born without guile, lived without guilt. Throughout His earthly life no apple the Evil One could offer enticed Him from His allegiance to holiness, and He unhesitatingly appealed to His enemies to convict Him of fault.[1] Nor was the testimony of His daily life to an absence of fault simply, to a merely negative sinlessness: not a selfish thought passed the horizon of His soul; His was a life of active beneficence, of ceaseless philanthropy. To refrain from evil, to go about doing good, such is a summary of His life on its human side. The narratives of the evangelists present the astonishing fact that the battle Adam fought and lost on the arena of Eden could again be undertaken by man; for, as was the life of the first Adam in bodily constitution and mental balance, such was that of the second Adam; further, immaculate in birth, His was also an immaculateness of course. To this sinlessness of Jesus the apostles frequently refer. Paul, as a divine ambassador, pleads with the Corinthians: "Be ye reconciled to God, Who hath made Him a sin-offering for us *who knew no sin*."[2] Peter appeals to the example of long-suffering in Him "who *did no sin*, neither was guile found in His mouth."[3] John confidently asserts: "Ye know that He was manifested to take away our sins; and in Him *is no sin*."[4] And the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews refers again and again to the same characteristic of the Redeemer's relation to the divine law, pointing his passionate appeal not to fall short of the rest of God by recalling the fact of the sympathy of Jesus, a High Priest susceptible of the sense of our infirmities, since "He was in all points tempted like as we are, yet *without sin*,"[5] arguing for the eternal intercession of Jesus from the

[1] John viii. 4, 6. [2] 2 Cor. v. 21. [3] 1 Pet. ii. 22.
[4] 1 John iii. 5. [5] Heb. iv. 15.

fact that He was "holy, harmless, undefiled, *separated from the whole race and category of sinners*," [1] and clenching his statement that Christ was once offered for the sins of many by averring that He will appear a second time, and in a more glorious manner, "*without sin* unto salvation." [2] Now, it is an inevitable consequence of that sinlessness which ruled in the physical as absolutely as in the moral sphere of Jesus' being, that He was not subject to death, in the New Testament sense of the word, as the punishment awarded by God to human sins. Hence the wisdom of those words of Anselm's: "No man but He has ever given to God by dying what some time or other he would not of necessity have lost, or has paid what he did not owe: but He of His own free will offered to the Father what He could never have lost by any necessity, and paid for sinners what He in no way owed for Himself." [3] And be it remembered that this deathlessness of Jesus was quite apart from that fund of life which He possessed as God. From His personal possession of overflowing life, He might indeed say, "I am the Life," and the apostle might say of Him, "In Him was life, and the life was the light of men." But it is not to this property of superabundant life, in all its fulness of meaning, to which allusion is now made; the sole fact to which attention is directed is this, that Jesus occupied the same position before the divine tribunal as Adam did before the Fall, and by virtue of the sinlessness of His life and nature did not come in any degree within the condemnatory clauses of the divine revelations to man. Consistently enough, therefore, referring no doubt both to the deathlessness of Deity and the deathlessness of the sinless, Jesus said to His disciples: "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This right have I received of my Father." [4]

[1] Heb. vii. 26. [2] Heb. ix. 28.

[3] *Cur Deus Homo*, Lib. II. cap. xviii. *b* (xix.): "Nullus unquam homo præter illum moriendo Deo dedit, quod aliquando necessitate perditurus non erat, aut solvit quod non debebat. Ille vero sponte Patri obtulit, quod nulla necessitate unquam amissurus erat, et solvit pro peccatoribus quod pro se non debebat."

[4] John x. 17, 18.

Quite harmoniously, therefore, with these conceptions, according to the New Testament *the suffering of Christ for sin is represented as a vicarious suffering—as a suffering for man's sake,*[1] *and in man's stead.*[2] "While we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." "The Son of Man came . . . to give His life a ransom for many."

At the same time, also quite consistently, *the New Testament represents the suffering of Christ* for sins *as an offering to God.* "And walk in love," writes Paul, "even as Christ also loved you, and gave Himself up for us a sacrifice and an atoning sacrifice to God."[3]

Moreover, probing the actual suffering of Christ for sins to its core, it is evident that *the New Testament describes this suffering as death,*—death borne for sins, borne voluntarily, borne in obedience to God, and as an offering to God, borne for man's sake and in man's stead; "that He by the grace of God might taste death for every man."[4] *Here let the scriptural doctrine of death be interpolated.*

Those cannot but misapprehend many important features of the New Testament revelation, who understand by this frequently recurring word and its derivatives, the "shuffling off this mortal coil," the cessation of the physical functions, the syncope which terminates the connection with this present life. Unquestionably death often means dissolution in scriptural phrase; but it is equally unquestionable that the scriptural conception of death is not exhausted by that definition. Death in the Scriptures, as in all language, is commonly more than decease. Decease itself is so solemn, so overwhelming, so mysterious, and so suggestive, that it becomes from its very indistinctness and engrossment the most facile image in poetry, religious literature, and in common conversation, for all that mysterious realm beyond the grave, for the unknown relations between the naked spirit and the eternal God, for the great incognizable to which man feels himself to be travelling. "How wonderful is death!" is the sentiment of mankind, and how

[1] Luke xxii. 19, 20; John x. 21; Rom. v. 6, 8.

[2] Matt. xx. 28; 2 Cor. v. 14, 15; Gal. iii. 13; Heb. ii. 9; Heb. ix. 28; 1 Tim. ii. 16.

[3] Eph. v. 2; Heb. ix. 14.

[4] Heb. ii. 9.

awful too; and having touched his deepest feelings and being present in all his truest life, man has used the word to convey all those things in the disembodied life of which he has no ken. Surely, if the significance of death has been enlarged by the æsthetic needs of more cultured times, it is not wonderful if the word meant more to the religious Jew than he found it easy to express. At any rate, the Scriptures clearly and convincingly show that they mean more by death than the margin of mortality. Time, for example, would have demonstrated our Lord's words to have been false when He cried in the Court of the Temple, "If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death,"[1] if the death He alluded to was decease. Or, again, what meaning, on such a supposition, could be attached to the words of John: "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother abideth in death"?[2]

An analysis of the New Testament usage of the word reveals the following variety. Frequently death is equivalent to dissolution, whether natural or violent.[3] The word also frequently signifies capital punishment, the extreme penalty of the law, whether Mosaic or civil.[4] As a slight remove from the preceding meaning, death comes to stand for the extreme penalty of the divine law.[5] From this the meaning is not far off, that death is all or any of the primitive effects of sin;[6] thus, an irresponsive and incapable volition, such as sin engenders,[7] that conflict between desire and fruition which every sinner experiences,[8] the spiritual decadence in its several stages which is the conscious result of sin,[9] the excision from Christian privileges which is the penalty of sin,[10] nay, the final doom of the impenitent, which is otherwise designated "eternal fire," "Gehenna," "the lake which burneth

[1] John viii. 53. [2] 1 John iii. 14.

[3] *E.g.* Matt. x. 21, xx. 18, xxvi. 26; Luke ii. 26; John xi. 4; Acts xxii. 4; Phil. ii. 21.

[4] *E.g.* Matt. xv. 4, xxvi. 66; Luke xxiii. 15, 22, xxiv. 20; Acts xxiii. 29, xxv. 11; Phil. i. 20. [5] Rom. i. 32.

[6] Rom. v. 12, 14, 17, 21, vi. 10, 16, 23, vii. 5, 10, 13, 24, viii. 2, 6; 2 Cor. i. 9, 10, iii. 7, vii. 10; 2 Tim. i. 10; Heb. ii. 9, v. 7; Jas. i. 15; 1 John iii. 14, v. 16, 17. [7] Rom. vii. 13.

[8] Rom. viii. 24. [9] 1 John v. 16; Rom. vii. 11. [10] 1 John v. 16.

with fire and brimstone,"[1]—each of these things is in the New Testament denominated death. It would thus appear that, if death frequently signifies what is more precisely put as violent or natural death, its more common significance is death *as the deliberate penalty attached by God to human sin.*

And this conception is substantiated by an appeal to the Old Testament. To the Jew, death was always the deliberate penalty attached by God to human sin, that penalty being something more than the loss of life. The Old Testament often uses the word death (its Hebrew equivalent, that is) to convey the idea of dissolution simply, but it also uses the word in a wider sense.[2] The first occasion of its use is wider. "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt," to translate literally the Hebrew intensive idiom, "die with death," was the divine proclamation to Adam and Eve, a proclamation which the issue proved to be completely false if death signified physical demise, but profoundly true if death was all the penal consequences of sin,—of alienation, unrest, predisposition to wrong, physical weakness, and all the manifold phases of that awful history which culminates in the grave and what it introduces to. So, too, the whole Mosaic Law, with its luminous suggestions of the value of the human soul and its dark hints of a solemn future not as yet clearly revealed, with its theocratic government, which seemed to bring the Jew under the same supersensuous rule as angels and fallen spirits, deepened by its capital penalties,—"Thou shalt surely die," echoing from every page—the inevitable association of dreadful mystery and heavy penalty with the passage from this mortal life.

And it is not without weight in this connection that the common contrasts in the New Testament to "death" are "life and peace," "life and immortality," "eternal life," "salvation;" and further, that the final exercise of the divine prerogative of punishment for sin is called "the second death."

But the point upon which we are insisting can scarcely be more forcibly put than it has been by a learned writer upon

[1] Rev. ii. 11, xx. 6, 14.

[2] Gen. ii. 17, iii. 4; Prov. ii. 18, v. 5, vii. 27, x. 2, xi. 4, xii. 29; Isa. xxv. 8.

the New Testament teaching upon Sin and Redemption:— "All the different consequences and effects of sin the New Testament comprises in the one leading idea of 'death.' For example, in the Gospel and Epistles of John, the state of man under sin described as 'death' is contrasted with the 'life' brought through Christ.[1] Then the Apostle Paul teaches that 'death' has come into the world by sin, and that this 'death' is the wages of sin.[2] What is meant by this idea of 'death' we may now consider decided. That meaning may be thus expressed: Death has not come into the world through sin in this sense, that an essential change has taken place in the physical organism of man, and the body, from being immortal, has become mortal. . . . The change wrought by sin can only be referred to the special *form* of death, and to the manner in which the irrevocableness of death has invaded the consciousness. The special form of death consists in the manifold terrors, pains, and distractions which evidently accompany the predominance of sin in man."[3] So surely does the New Testament regard the significance of *death* to lie in the numerous and interminable effects of sin, that an eminent philologist has not scrupled to define the New Testament meaning of *θάνατος*, amongst other meanings, as *omnis miseria et infelicitas, maxime quæ est vitiositatis et peccatorum pœna in hac pariter ac in futura vita*, "the essence of misery and infelicity, especially that which is the penalty of vice and sin in this world and in the next."[4]

When, then, the New Testament speaks of the potency of the death of Christ, it is not meant that the Redeemer's submission to mere decease as such effected the forgiveness of sins, but that His submission to death as the determinate penalty attached by God to human sin has wrought the gigantic effect. What the death of the cross was in itself, we are unable from our evidence, possibly from our natural

[1] John iii. 36, v. 24, vi. 50, viii. 51, xi. 25, 26; 1 John iii. 14.

[2] Rom. v. 12, etc., vi. 21, 23, vii. 10; Eph. ii. 5, etc.

[3] Klaiber, *Die Neutestamentliche Lehre von der Sünde und Erlösung*, 1836, pp. 42–45.

[4] Schleusner, *Novum Lexicon Græco-Latinum in Novum Test. in loco*; compare Cremer, *Biblisch-Theologisches Wörterbuch* (*Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek*, T. & T. Clark), *in loco*.

capacity, to decide; the mental anguish superadded to the physical laceration are beyond our ken; nor is it at all probable that the pangs of the lost, to say nothing of the recollections of the spirits of the just, if they were within our reach, could in any way enlighten us upon the sufferings Jesus underwent. In some way, by us unknown, if not unknowable, He suffered penal death as none else can or will: "He tasted death for every man." It is true that the peculiar agony of the crucifixion as narrated, especially that awful cry of "Eloi" from Him who had lived in the hourly support and joy of an ever-present sense of the Divine Fatherhood, seems to imply that the horror of the penal death experienced lay in the hiding of the divine countenance, in the harrowing lovelessness of the divine withdrawal. Be this as it may, it was, at any rate—so the New Testament teaches—the submission to death as the penal infliction of God which achieved the grand result of human salvation. Undoubtedly that submission to death was the act of a precise moment; so much is clear without entering into that perplexing problem which agitated and divided the schoolmen, whether man would have died if sin had not come into the world,—a problem, by the way, to which the Pauline distinction of a psychical and pneumatic body would seem to afford an affirmative answer. Still, whatever answer is returned, the case is not altered: if death existed before the Fall, it became a very different thing after; psychical demise became pneumatic suffering; and when Christ submitted to death in our behalf, the awful moment of decease received its solemnity as well as its merit from the voluntary endurance of the pangs of penal death, whatever they may be.

The discussion is long, but important. *Death*, in the scriptural sense of the word, *is more than decease: death is an evolution of punishment, consequent upon an evolution in the divine withdrawal from man because of sin.* This evolution of penalty is seen primarily in the disturbance of the balance between flesh and spirit, next in developing depravity, next in decease, and finally in that supreme divine withdrawal from man which is called the Second Death. *Now, this divine withdrawal, as far as it could be experienced by the*

God-man, not in its long evolution, but in its supremest agony, was borne by the Incarnate Word for our sakes and in our stead. So the New Testament teaches. This is the explanation of the cry from the cross. This is the explanation of the agony of Gethsemane.

Third, on the EFFECTS ATTRIBUTED TO THE ATONEMENT.

Advancing next to the effects attributed to Christ's atonement, those effects, *as regards man,* are said to pertain either to *the neutralizing of sin as transgression,* or to *the neutralizing of sin as depravity.*

For instance, Jesus is said to have died to obtain eternal life for man. "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth may in Him have eternal life."[1] This is one way of putting the neutralization of sin as depravity. Again, Jesus is said to have died *to obtain for man the gift of the Spirit.* "Saved us . . . through the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which He poured out upon us richly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour."[2] This again is another scriptural expression for the neutralizing of sin as depravity. And yet again the death of Jesus is described as *eradicating sin,*[3] *obtaining holiness* for man,[4] and *redeeming* man *from selfishness,*[5] all of which are modes of describing the neutralizing of sin as depravity.

Further, the death of Christ is described in the New Testament as obtaining the forgiveness of our sins,[6] as *effecting reconciliation* with God,[7] and as *securing the gift of justification,*[8] all of which are, it is evident, modes of describing the neutralization of sin as transgression.

As regards Jesus Christ Himself, the effects of His death are stated to be that *He made manifest thereby His great love towards us,*[9] that thereby *He showed His willing obedience to the Father,*[10] that *He thereby pleased the Father,*[11] who consequently conferred upon the Son the greatest honour, and that thereby

[1] John iii. 14, 15, xvii. 1, 2.
[2] Gal. iii. 13, 14; Titus iii. 5, 7.
[3] Heb. ix. 26; 1 John i. 7–9; Titus ii. 14.
[4] Eph. v. 25–27; Heb. xiii. 12.
[5] 2 Cor. v. 15.
[6] Matt. xxvi. 28; Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14.
[7] Rom. v. 10; Col. i. 19, 20.
[8] Rom. iii. 24–26, v. 9.
[9] Gal. ii. 20; Rev. i. 5.
[10] John vi. 38; Heb. v. 9.
[11] John x. 17; Heb. ii. 9.

He displayed majestic self-sacrifice and heroism,[1] whilst *He also signally defeated the purposes of Satan.*[2]

At the same time, by his death the Lord Jesus *gave the supreme manifestation,* on the one hand, *of the Father's holiness,*[3] and, *on the other hand, of the Father's love.*[4]

Fourth, as to the MODUS OPERANDI OF THE DEATH OF JESUS.

Yet again, how did the death of Jesus atone for sin, according to the New Testament? What was the *modus operandi?* Here again the scriptural statements, though various, are strictly consistent.

Thus *the basal thought* which explained the mode of working of Christ's death is as follows, according to the New Testament: Christ being such as He was (God and man and love and mediator and archetype), and His death being such as it was (voluntary, obedient, unmerited, for sin), the *modus operandi* was *a substitutionary as well as altruistic bearing of the penalty of death originally decreed, in the wisdom of God, upon sin, a submission for our sakes and in our stead, and at the Father's wish, to that penalty of divine withdrawal from man, and all that such withdrawal means;* not that Christ suffered the entire evolution of the penalty which the Bible calls death, but that He suffered its extreme stage, its acutest pain, unimaginable, it is true, by us, yet evidently of the most poignant horror.

From this basal thought all *the other points* connected with the biblical statement of the mode of working of Christ's death directly *follow.* Thus the death of Christ is called a *ransom,*[5] of course in the Old Testament sense: naturally, for the Old Testament ransom was a restoration to covenant privileges because of the pouring forth of the life of a substitute; and it is just restoration to covenant privileges which the death of Christ, as the pouring forth of the life of our substitute, effects. Again, the death of Christ is described as a *sacrifice,* in the Old Testament sense[6]: naturally, again, because the submission of Christ to death was, by its very nature, the offering of His life to God. And, again, the death

[1] 1 Pet. ii. 21–23.
[2] Col. ii. 13–15; Heb. ii. 14, 15.
[3] Rom. v. 8.
[4] Rom. iii. 25, 26.
[5] Matt. xx. 28; Eph. i. 7.
[6] Eph. v. 2; Heb. x. 14.

of Christ is described as an *atonement*,[1] in the Old Testament sense: naturally, again, because the death of Christ was what the death of the animal was under the Old Covenant, the neutralization of the effects of sin as transgression by the pouring out of the life of a substitute. And, finally, the death of Christ is described as the death of a *surety*[2]: naturally enough, seeing that Christ paid in our behalf the penalty which is due from the sinner to God.

Fifth, as to the EXTENT OF THE ATONEMENT.

The New Testament teaches that Christ died for all men.[3]

Such, then, are the several interrelated conceptions which the New Testament reveals concerning the work of Christ in the salvation of man. But, to complete the survey, observe how this biblical doctrine of redemption dovetails with the biblical doctrines of man and of sin. *Let a running survey of the related biblical teaching upon man, sin, and redemption, complete what has gone before.*

What idea, then, had God in creating man? The answer opens before us *the biblical doctrine of man.*

At his creation man was more than animal. The inspiration of the Almighty gave him intelligence. By this divine inspiration man was spirit as well as body, and was allied by his spirit to the divine as he was allied by his body to the animal. Further, body and spirit as man was, he was sinless; not, however, in the sense that he was incapable of sin, but as being innocent because ignorant of sin. Man was innocent rather than holy; his goodness was by nature, not by resolve, instinctive rather than deliberate. Further, man was healthy; healthy but mortal, not in the sense that he must die, but in the sense that he was liable to death. Yet further, both body and spirit as he was, man was capable of almost infinite development; for he had been made, not with the limited range of the animal, but with the power of an endless life and growth. In short, *man was created pure, but liable to sin; healthy, but liable to death; inexperienced, but capable of a vast development.*

[1] Heb. ii. 17; 1 John ii. 2. [2] Heb. vii. 22.
[3] John iii. 16; Rom. v. 15; 2 Cor. v. 14, 15; 1 John ii. 2.

The growth that was *possible to man, moreover, was,* it is evident, *to become holy as well as pure, immortal as well as healthy, fully developed on all sides of his nature, instead of inexperienced.* This, then, is the problem latent in his creation —how to grow to holiness, immortality, rotund culture. Here comes in another important feature in the biblical doctrine of man. The divinely pre-arranged destiny for man was that he might fulfil the divine purpose of such growth as has been named. Innocent, he was to become holy; healthy, he was to become immortal; inexperienced, he was to become developed. *But how?* The biblical reply is ever—by the co-operation of God with human endeavour. All human life, in the divine plan, was to be a sacrament, an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace. In other words, if man was to become deliberately holy as well as instinctively innocent, that could only follow upon the gift of the Divine Spirit to man. If the healthy body and spirit were to cease to be liable to death, and become immortal, that too was to follow upon the gift of the Spirit to man; and if the spirit of man, that which differentiated man from the animal, was to grow, as grow it might, to full stature intellectually, morally, religiously, this also could only follow upon the continuous gift to man of the divine life. The point is important. According to the divine purpose, human perfection could only be attained in union with God, could never be attained by human isolation or self-seeking. As the phrase goes, man had been created perfect—perfect, that is, not as the second Adam but as the first, perfect as is the psychical man, to use Paul's phrase, but not as the pneumatic man. But even this perfection of the lower grade could only grow to the perfection of the higher grade, not of itself and apart from God, but solely in submission to, and in fellowship with, the Divine Author of human being. Fellowship, intercourse, communion, whichever word be preferred, being unbroken between man and his Maker, holiness, immortality, and growth to the full stature of man would result. *Man, body and spirit, innocent, sane in frame and mind, and inexperienced as a babe, was to become holy, deathless, full, always growing from father to son and from age to age towards an ever more perfect stature, and all by the*

observance of one condition, fellowship with God: Divine approach to man was to secure human approximation to God. Such, it would seem from the Bible, was the divine idea in creating man.

Then came the first act of disobedience, followed by all the direful consequences. *The doctrine of man becomes dovetailed with the doctrine of sin.* Man turned from God, and God withdrew from man. Disordered relations were introduced into the moral cosmos. The divine indignation against sin must proclaim itself. For God to recognise sin is to condemn it; and for God to condemn sin is to condemn it with abhorrence. The holiness of God, the wholeness of God, that integrity of the divine life which guarantees the integrity of the universe, that divine holiness, the preservation and assertion of which is the one great condition of the wellbeing and the orderly development of creation, demands righteous resentment and holy indignation at human sin. As Paul puts it,—"The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness;" or, as the Old Testament phrase goes, Jehovah is a "jealous" God, a God energetic in holiness.

In moral indignation, therefore, against sin, penalty fell upon the sinner. *The penalty appended to disobedience was death.* "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," or as the Hebrew expresses it, "dying thou shalt die."

Now, continuing the biblical doctrine of sin, of the effects of sin, *what is this "death,"* which is the penalty deliberately attached by God to wrongdoing? Is it simply the cessation of the physical functions, the syncope which terminates our present life? Is death simply decease? Certainly the Old Testament as well as the New, as we have seen, frequently gives to death a wider sense than dissolution. The first occasion of the use of the word is wider—"In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" was the proclamation proved by the issue to be completely false if death meant demise, but to be profoundly true if death was all the penal consequences of sin,—alienation from God, unrest, predisposition to wrong, physical weakness, and all the manifold phases of that awful history which culminates in the grave and what follows the grave. The fact is, as we have seen, the

penal consequences decreed by God upon sin, in wisdom as we must believe, and for the highest good of man and the universe, form a terrible evolution, beginning in the loss of balance between body and spirit, continuing in the supremacy of the carnal appetites, passing into a new phase at what we commonly call death, and culminating in that awful state which is called "the second death." *Death*, then, *is an inclusive word for all the evolving consequences arranged by God, all-wise and all-holy, to follow sin.*

Further, it is possible to probe closer the biblical idea of death as a penalty. *The heart of death*, its core, its centre, in the scriptural sense, *is the divine withdrawal.* Only in constant communion with the Spirit of God, as we have seen, can man fulfil his destiny; but man having exercised his faculty of free volition to prefer Satan to God, the penalty decreed by God is that the intercourse between the human spirit and the Divine Spirit cease. Man withdraws from God, and as a consequence God withdraws from man. As the inevitable result, he who in God lives, in the higher spiritual sense, without God dies, in the deeper spiritual meaning of death.

Just what is involved in this death of man will be understood by recalling what has been said as to the divine idea in creating man. Man, we saw, was created pure, but liable to sin; healthy, but liable to death; inexperienced, but capable of a vast development. Further, as we also saw, it was by contact of the spirit of man with the Spirit of God, that man was to become holy as well as pure, immortal as well as healthy; not inexperienced, but the subject of a perfect and infinite development. All this fulfilment of the divine plan was—let the fact be again emphasized—to be consequent upon uninterrupted communion with God. As man's body grows by means of its appropriate physical food and exercise, so man's spirit might grow by its appropriate spiritual food. But *now, let us suppose that* in intense moral indignation at sin, *the Divine Father and Lord feels it imperative to withdraw His Spirit from man — what will follow?* Are not the necessary effects evident? *Will not man become unholy instead of pure? Will he not become diseased and dying instead*

of healthy? Gifted still with a capacity of ceaseless development, will not man necessarily grow away from, instead of towards, goodness, godliness, God? How terrible a comment upon such remarks has human history been!

But even now the whole case, as presented by the biblical doctrine of sin, *is not before us. Man is not isolated.* No man can be good without improving others; no man can be bad without deteriorating others. Nor is this the whole case. *One generation has an organic influence upon the generation following.* In the constitution of things, the wide-reaching effects of the hereditary relation make themselves felt. If a righteous race propagates a race with a predisposition to righteousness, a sinful race will propagate a race with a predisposition to sin. Thus, as is evident, it is insufficient, in thinking of the consequences of sin, to observe the consequences of the divine withdrawal from one individual or one generation. Sin must be viewed as nature as well as penalty. *The penalty of sin must be regarded as affecting constitution.* In addition to the consequences which follow individual sinful acts, there are the constitutional effects of sin, there are the constitutional effects of the penalty decreed upon sin. The sins of the fathers have left their mark in the bodily and mental structure of the children, limiting ever more and more their freedom of choice, ever more and more predisposing them to wrong. In short, the penalty decreed upon sin is, that the Spirit of God withdraws Himself from man, and as Augustine would have said, "man's supernatural gifts were taken away," and, as a result, man's nature, by the disturbance of the balance between spirit and body, becomes depraved, experiences the evolution of penal death, and this in rapidly increasing measure as the generations pass.

This, then, is the problem of human redemption,—on the one hand, to abolish the effects of sin as nature; and on the other hand, to abolish the effects of sin as transgression. In short, normal relations will be restored in the universe, when the effects of sin upon man, and at the same time the effects of sin upon God, are counterbalanced.

The clear statement of the problem is a long step to its solution.

As we have seen, the constitutional effects of sin have been produced throughout generations by the cessation of fellowship, consequent upon sin, between the spirit of man and the Spirit of God. *Manifestly*, therefore, *the constitutional effects can be neutralized by the return of the Holy Spirit.* This return of the Spirit is one great effect of faith in Jesus. In Jesus vital union with God is restored. In Jesus, Who gives us of the Spirit, the constitutional effects of sin are increasingly overcome, and the disasters of our birth-connection are repaired. The eternal life which Jesus gives accentuates once more the spiritual side of man, and the dead find new birth. In a word, the consequences of sin as depravity are steadily annulled by the presence in man of the gift of the Holy Ghost. This side of the great atoning work of Christ has been mentioned again and again in this chapter.

The counteraction of the effects of sin as transgression, the Atonement in its Godward aspect, the removal of the guilt of rebellion, the healing of the schism introduced into the universe by the unrighteous choice of man,—this side of the Atonement, however it be expressed, *is by no means so simple a problem.* Certainly, on the broad ground of reason, its solution is by no means clear. *It is just here, however, that divine revelation comes to our aid. For, according to the testimony of the New Testament, the death of the Lord Jesus Christ is so accepted by the Father in our behalf, that the restoration of the Spirit is made possible to those who believe; and the death of Calvary, which really was a bearing for our sakes and in our stead of the penalty of death decreed upon human sin, death itself being the divine withdrawal and its consequences, saves those who place their trust in it from the penal death decreed upon sin*, God remaining just, as well as the justifier of those who believe.

This then is the New Testament doctrine of Atonement, meaning by the Atonement not the entire work of Christ in saving man, but its Godward aspect, that reconciling work which "covers" sin, which renders it possible for God to forgive sin and cure its effects, other conditions being fulfilled,—this, then, is the New Testament doctrine of Atonement—*that He Whose*

office it had ever been to reveal the mind of the Father, and Who had assumed human form, having passed through this mortal life without sin, and being therefore non-amenable to any penalty decreed upon transgression, had voluntarily submitted to that curse of death, with all its mystery of meaning, including the sense of the divine withdrawal, which He had Himself announced, and by that submission rendered the forgiveness of sins possible to man.

This doctrine will now be at once illustrated and emphasized by an examination of the several theories of the Atonement held during the course of the history of the Christian Church.

CHAPTER IV.

CRITICAL REVIEW OF THEORIES OF THE ATONEMENT.

"Aber, Freund, ist es blos die Kirchenlehre, die hier fällt, oder die der Schrift selber?"—THOLUCK, *Die Lehre von der Sünde und vom Versöhner oder die wahre Weihe des Zweiflers*, 9th ed. p. 93.

THE possibility of framing a theory of the Atonement, regarded by many as altogether chimerical, resolves itself in our case into the possibility of combining into one consistent view the numerous passages of the Gospels and Epistles which have reference to the atoning work of Jesus. This possibility has been demonstrated in the preceding chapter, and the theory there advanced can only be overthrown by demonstrating it to be inconsistent with Scripture, by demonstrating it to be inadequately representative of Scripture, or by demonstrating the unreliableness of Scripture itself. Not a step has been taken into the purely speculative region; all that has been done has been to classify and colligate the scattered testimonies of Jesus and His apostles. The atonement of Jesus being a matter of revelation, it is at any rate open to us "to search the Scriptures." "We may be very sure that God intended us to know as much of the method of our salvation by the death of Christ as His word reveals."[1] With Warburton we assert that, "why this precise mode of redemption by the death and sufferings of Christ was preferred to all others in the eternal purpose of the Godhead exceeds the power of human reason to discover, because His attribute of wisdom, which it is out of the reach of man to apply to this inquiry, is here concerned;" but we would add with that learned man, "when it has been proved by fact that a religion was revealed in which *this mode*

[1] Crawford, *The Doctrine of the Holy Scripture respecting the Atonement*, p. 16.

of redemption is employed, the reason may lend her modest aid." [1] "The *secret things* belong unto the Lord our God, but those things which are *revealed* belong to *us* and to our *children* for ever." [2] The theory advanced simply pretends to be a complete induction from Scripture.

But this is not the only conception attached to a *theory* of the Atonement, nor is it the common conception; much confusion of thought will be avoided if the ambiguity of the word is clearly placed before the mind. What is a theory? The question at issue is nothing more nor less than the adoption of the Baconian or the scholastic philosophy. Two answers have been returned. According to the one opinion, a theory is a hypothesis suggested by the mind and employed to explain certain facts; according to the other, a theory is a generalization suggested by the facts themselves, and gathering those facts into one accordant view. A theory of the former kind has its birth in the anticipatory rush of thought in contemplation—that is to say, in the comparison of thoughts with facts; a theory of the latter kind originates in the tentative adjustment of thought—that is to say, in the comparison of facts with thoughts. And, as a matter of fact, there is all the difference in the world between the two conceptions. In the one case, a theory is a proposition assumed to account for certain facts, and has no other evidence of its truth than that it affords some explanation of those facts; in the other case, a theory is a proposition directly induced from certain facts, and verifiable by those facts. A theory which is a hypothesis is a speculation; a theory which is a generalization is a complete induction. These distinctions may be illustrated by an example. In works on chemistry much is said of chemical theories; what is meant is one of two things,—such hypotheses as the atomic theory, which can be at best but denominated as probable, this probability depending upon the adaptability to the explanation of many collateral phenomena; and also such well-accredited and verifiable generalizations as those of the composition of water or phosphoric anhydride, or as those yet more abstract yet equally verifiable laws of combination by

[1] Warburton, *The Divine Legation of Moses*, Book IX. Introd.

[2] Deut. xxix. 29.

weight and by volume. A simpler and less technical illustration would be this: One man imagines there is some hidden relation between the inhabitants of Britain and the Jews, and jumps to the conclusion that the English are the ten lost tribes, — this is a subjective theory; another laboriously searches history, and, by a minute and lengthy examination of credible testimonies, finds that the English are a mixed race, formed by the intermarriage of Normans, Saxons, Danes, and Celts, without the admixture of a single Shemitic element, —this is an objective theory. Now, although there have been some rare cases in which these two varieties of theories, so different in their method and in their principles, have coincided in their results, as when Goethe, by that marvellous faculty of his of tracing resemblances in difference, hit upon the great law of vegetable morphology, which was only received into the established laws of science after the long labours of De Candolle and Schleiden; practically, however, it is found that what may be for convenience called a subjective theory, is usually based upon a mere analogical resemblance, whilst an objective theory, to use the obvious contrast, is a logically correct inference; and the progress of all science has been characterised by the subordination, if not the relinquishment, of theories of the former class, and the introduction of those of the latter. With respect to the numerous theories of the Atonement which have been advanced, it must be confessed that they have been for the most part subjective theories, and a great step will have been taken towards unanimity of opinion when this is recognised. What we have designated a theory of the Atonement is an objective theory; regarding Scripture as the man of science regards nature, a law, so to speak, has been inferred from the series of facts, as it were, with which Scripture has provided us. In the absence, however, of a suitable term, and one which would not introduce a certain odium into the discussion, it will be a matter of convenience to use the word theory, as is done in all the sciences, to signify either an objective or subjective theory, leaving it to the context to convey what variety of theory is intended.

In the preceding chapter we have endeavoured to infer a perfect induction from the New Testament statements as to

the nature of the Atonement effected by the death of Jesus. But in the introduction to this treatise it was stated that the doctrines of Scripture may be advantageously studied by a critical examination of those analogous doctrines which other investigators have held to be scriptural, as well as by a direct interrogation of the Scriptures themselves. A greater advantage might even be plausibly anticipated from this negative method than from the method which is more direct. Judgment is less rare than originality. Any educated man can compare, few can discover. It is more easy to decide the conformity of a doctrine with Scripture, than to deduce a doctrine from scriptural non-conformity. And, with respect to our special inquiry, much will be gained if our theory is shown to possess all the scriptural features of other theories, and to exclude those features which are unscriptural. Gold is assayed by a comparison with the finest gold previously obtained; it is peculiarly desirable to test our theory by a review of the leading theories which have been formed, oftentimes to be greeted with acclaim and handed downwards with authority, during the history of the Christian Church. Be it remembered that all we have to do is to bring into prominence the scriptural and unscriptural elements of these theories, nothing else. Undoubtedly there are other methods of testing the truth of Christian doctrine, but with this we have, in this book, nothing to do. The falsity of any doctrine of the Atonement would be demonstrated by showing that it was inconsistent with itself, or inconsistent with the universal experience of the Christian Church; the only inconsistency we have to do with is inconsistency with Scripture.

The Bible, that is to say, in the view here taken, provides doctrines as Nature provides laws. Nature is full of facts, from which man's mind deduces laws, and the Bible supplies innumerable data from which the Christian intelligence frames doctrines. In other words, from the explicit instances of a doctrine contained in Scripture, the theologian constructs the doctrine implicitly there. Now many generations of men have been endeavouring to construct a doctrine of the Atonement from the biblical data, and it will be both instructive and helpful to inquire with what success. We may be able

to appropriate their truth, whilst eschewing their error. For a while our task is to be critical. And in our criticism, two canons only are to be permitted. One canon is,—that no doctrine can be accepted as adequate which does not embody the whole teaching of Scripture upon the Atonement; or, more briefly, *one-sided doctrine is inadequate.* The other canon is, —that no doctrine can be accepted as an adequate doctrine of the Atonement which contradicts the Bible teaching on any other subject; or, more briefly, *unscriptural doctrine is inadequate.* These are the only critical canons admissible; for, as has been said, the Bible, and the Bible only, is the source or the test of any doctrine acknowledged in this inquiry. Human speculations as such do not concern us, not even our own speculations.

However, let a caution be at once uttered. In prosecuting the study of the various views on the Atonement held during the long history of the Christian Church, two questions must be rigorously distinguished. Theory is one thing, practice another; theoretical belief is one thing, practical belief another. A man may believe heartily in the Atonement of Jesus who has no consistent theory in which to express his belief carefully and fully. It is one thing to ask, to what extent was the death of Christ regarded, in the churches, as the condition of the restoration of sinners to the divine favour? it is quite another question to ask, in what way, if any, and with what success, was a doctrine framed by the churches to explain this connection between Christ's death and the removal of the consequences of sin? To put the same distinction in another way: any one may quote the scriptural phrases concerning the atoning work of Christ, feeling them to convey important truth concerning human redemption; it is not every man who can, or cares to, gather up all these scriptural modes of expression into one adequate, and complete, and balanced, and consistent doctrine. The light and life from the cross may stream into any soul; it is not given to every soul to express the source of that life and light in scientific form and with scientific precision. This distinction is all-important. For it is necessary clearly to recognise that the fact of the connection between the death

of Christ and the restoration of intercourse between God and man may be fully acknowledged, when no attempt is made to present a theory of the fact, even a biblical theory of the fact, to say nothing of a speculative theory, and may even be acknowledged with considerable influence where the explanation framed is unsatisfactory or erroneous. The practical standpoint in religion is one thing; the theological standpoint is another, and should not be confounded therewith.

This distinction carefully noted, let us now investigate *the history of the doctrine of Atonement* in the first ten centuries of our era, that is, in the days *prior to Anselm of Canterbury.*

For a while the Christian Churches were so happy in the experiences of the Atonement that they did not closely inquire into what the Atonement was. The practical had not as yet given birth to the scientific interest. So it came to pass that, in the early ages of the Christian Church, the atoning work of Christ was generally referred to in the words of the New Testament. Besides, as yet the relation between the death of Christ and the remission of sins had scarcely become a matter of serious inquiry, to say nothing of hot dispute. The topic of anxious and often embittered discussion was the Person and not the Work of the Redeemer. Nor was it until the doctrine of the Person had been settled at Nicæa that prominence was given to the notion of the redemption wrought for us by Him Who was Very God,—God of God, and Light of Light. For, as has been well said, "as a general rule, the rise of successive heresies is the occasion and measure of dogmatic statements of the faith. We do not, therefore, look in the Ante-Nicene Fathers for any elaborate discussion of questions not yet brought into controversy. And hence, even in the central doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation, we know how halting and inadequate, to use the mildest terms, their language often is, before the Arian, Sabellian, Monophysite, and Nestorian heresies had forced out into bolder relief the contrary definitions of the Church. . . . Neither, again, can we reasonably expect to find in earlier writers that precision of theological statement which only came into vogue when theology, partly in the conflict with error, partly through the influence of Greek philosophy at

Alexandria, began to be formed into a science. On the subject of the Atonement, the Ante-Nicene Fathers do not, with the exception of Irenæus and Origen, propound any definite theory. But they speak, in connection with the Incarnation, and in general terms often borrowed directly or indirectly from the language of Scripture, of the sufferings, the death, the blood, the sacrifice, of Christ, as being the means of our redemption."[1] Indeed, that the fact of redemption by the death of Jesus has been commonly acknowledged in all ages of the Church, even so anti-orthodox a writer as Baur again and again acknowledges.

On the other hand, that concentrated intellectual attention from the marriage of which with fact doctrine is born, is not equally characteristic of all the ages. And it happens that in the century immediately succeeding the apostles, it is rather the fact of atonement by the death of Jesus which is emphasized than any constructive doctrine of that fact. *From the extant writings of the so-called Apostolic Fathers, it is manifest that they framed neither an objective nor a subjective theory of the death of Christ; for them the biblical statements expressed with sufficient precision the cardinal doctrines of their faith,* and in their intense realization of the atonement that was in Christ, deep emotion precluding and superseding exact science, they had no desire to express in logical form, and with suitable limitation, that which stirred them so deeply. Thus it is said in the Epistle of Barnabas: "The Lord condescended to deliver His body to death, that by remission of our sins we might be sanctified, and this is effected by the shedding of His blood." Again, Clement of Rome writes: "His blood was shed for our salvation; by the will of God He has given His flesh for our flesh, His soul for our souls." And again: "Let us look then to the blood of Christ, and behold how precious is His blood to God, since being shed for our salvation it has offered to the whole world the grace of repentance." In the *Epistles of Ignatius*, again, there are references, in general terms, to the sufferings of Christ for man. Thus in the *Epistle to the Smyrnæans*, it is said that Christ "suffered all these things for us that we might be saved, and

[1] Oxenham, *The Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement*, pp. 114, 115.

suffered really, as He also really raised Himself." So, too, in Polycarp's *Epistle to the Philippians*, he says that Christ "persevered even unto death for our sins, whom God raised, having loosed the pains of hell;" and again, he says in language moulded on Peter's, that "He bore our sins in His own body to the tree, Who did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth, but He endured all things for our sakes that we may live in Him." And yet another document of the first century may be quoted, the *Epistle to Diognetus*, where we read: "God, the Master and Maker of all things, Who created all things and disposed them in order, was not only a lover of men, but also long-suffering; and He, indeed, was always such, and will be precious and good, and without anger and true; and He alone is good, and conceived the great and ineffable design which He communicated only to His Son. . . . When our iniquity was full, and it was perfectly manifest that punishment and death were the expected recompense . . . He did not hate or repulse us, or think evil of us, but was long-suffering and bore with us, and took our sins upon Him. He Himself gave up His Son as a ranson for us, the Holy for the unholy, the Sinless for the sinful, the Righteous for the unrighteous, the Incorruptible for the corruptible, the Immortal for the mortal. For what else but His righteousness could cover our sins? O sweet change! O unsearchable work! O unexpected benefits! that the wickedness of many should be covered by one Righteous One, the righteousness of One justify many sinners." [1]

Similarly, in the second century of the Christian era, Justin Martyr expresses himself as follows: "The Father willed that His Christ should take upon Himself the curses of all for the

[1] Compare Shedd, *History of Christian Doctrine* (T. & T. Clark), vol. ii. pp. 208–211; Oxenham, *Catholic Doctrine of Atonement*, pp. 116–120; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, § 68; and Thomson, Bampton Lectures for 1853, Lecture vi. Dr. Shedd thus sums up his investigations: "It is evident, from this examination of the very brief writings of the Apostolic Fathers, that they recognised the doctrine of atonement for sin by the death of the Redeemer as one taught in the Scriptures, and especially in the writings of those two great apostles, John and Paul, at whose feet they had most of them been brought up; they did not, however, venture beyond the phraseology of Scripture, and they attempted no rationale of the dogma."

whole race of man;" and this passage may be supplemented by many others from his *Dialogue with Trypho*, where the death of Christ is viewed as the condition of our salvation. In Clement of Alexandria, and in Claudius Apollinaris, in Irenæus, too, and in Tertullian, in Hippolytus and in Cyprian, the same stress upon biblical language is evident. Nor is it necessary to accumulate passages. Quotations from the Bible, more or less exact,—verses, phrases, technicalities,—are the common modes of reference to the Atonement in the first two centuries. All writers "ascribe with one voice a real and most vital efficacy to the sacrifice of Calvary in restoring us to life and immortality, but without attempting any precise explanation of *how* this result is brought about."[1]

When we search, however, *for more than this acknowledgment of the fact of atonement by the death of Jesus*,—when we inquire, that is to say, for any constructive doctrine of the Atonement,—all the evidence available goes to show that *the predominant theory*, and almost the only theory, *from the second century to the tenth was the Satan theory*. The death of Christ, it was said, wrought atonement because it was a ransom paid to the devil.

The history of this Satan theory is as curious as its vogue. That our Lord's death was in some sense a conquest over Satan already appears in Barnabas and in Ignatius, in the first century, nay appears, as we have seen, in the New Testament itself. The theory was undoubtedly suggested by the necessity felt, in the early Christian contests with Gnosticism, to define with some precision the effect of the work of Christ upon the kingdom of Satan.

Amongst the earliest of the intellectual struggles of the Christian Fathers were those with that singular eclectic product, known in ancient times as the Gnosis, and in modern as Gnosticism, which, blending into a remarkable whole the philosophies of Greece, Persia, and India, the mythologies of the Aryan and Shemitic races, and the religions of Judaism and Christianity, formed common ground for such opposite natures as Valentine the Egyptian, Cerdo the Syrian, Bardesan the Armenian, and Marcion of Sinope. It is no part of our

[1] Oxenham, p. 129.

labours to attempt what has tasked the ingenuity and the genius of a Neander and a Baur, a Ritter and a Mansel, and to classify the several contributions to this extraordinary theory of the universe; all we have to do is to state its distorting influence in one aspect only, and show the inevitable results of Gnosticism upon a theory of the Atonement. This will best be done by tracing the Gnosis in its most general form; and it happens that, with all the fluctuations visible in the several Gnostic systems, and with all their variations of detail, it is nevertheless possible to give a concise statement of the principles common to all. The source of all spiritual existence, according to the Gnosis, is the infinite and incomprehensible Light. Opposed to the incomprehensible Light is godless and eternal matter, the kingdom of Satan and his demons. These two kingdoms of matter and spirit are in perpetual conflict. Not that the incomprehensible Light comes into contact with godless matter, but the Light informs matter by a series of æons, or spirits of the supernatural world, who emanate from itself or from each other, and who constitute, in fact, the Pleroma or realm of divine life (to which the Kenoma or realm of matter corresponds). By virtue of this relation of the incomprehensible Light to godless matter, these æons or spirits of the Pleroma, themselves revelations of the attributes of the Light, are imprisoned and oppressed by matter, and it becomes necessary to liberate them and restore them to the heavenly world. In the terrific conflict between the Pleroma and Kenoma, which is the result, the creation and redemption of man are important stages. The immediate cause of creation is the Demiurge, the Prince, therefore, of this world, a being of neither divine origin nor divine nature, and who is destitute both of divine knowledge and divine love. With characteristic ignorance he imagines himself the lord of all things: he dwells in the planetary heaven, and owns as subjects the whole range of sidereal spirits; yet his very acts of creation are stages in his overthrow, for he unconsciously receives from the incomprehensible Light the impetus of his creative and regulative acts. Further, of the macrocosm the Demiurge creates, man is the microcosm, embodying in himself the spiritual and material worlds; man

stands, in fact, at the centre of the universe, and by virtue of his triple nature, hylic, psychic, and pneumatic, child of the dust as he is, he is capable of divine knowledge, notwithstanding the fact that the higher nature he possesses is submerged by the supremacy of the Demiurge and his tributary spirits. Another step in the downfall of the Demiurge is the work of redemption achieved by Jesus Christ, the highest of the æons, whose it should be to reveal the Light most fully, and to complete the ransom of the spiritual nature of man. In order not to submit Himself to the dominion of matter, Jesus was regarded as only apparently assuming human form, and thus, by a deceptive life and an illusory death, working the liberation of man. We need add no more of the general system, nor need we cursorily or minutely examine the several Gnostic doctrines of the Atonement extant, which, in the reconstruction of the entire mass of biblical truth in accordance with their fundamental principles, were undertaken by individual writers; suffice it to say that, holding, as a logical consequence of the philosophic postulate of the godlessness of matter, the common principle of the *doketic* or apparent humanity of Jesus, it is evident that all the Gnostic systems were incapacitated from holding any scriptural conception of the death of Christ. The New Testament asserts by every possible variety of evidence the true humanity of Jesus; and the doctrine of Atonement by His vicarious death upon Golgotha is robbed of its most necessary support, if the human life of the Redeemer is regarded as a semblance, and His death as a sham to deceive demons. These philosophic systems of a past and irrecoverable age are a series of crucial experiments which demonstrate the futility of hoping to express the teaching of the apostles upon the Atonement, when the cardinal truth of the Incarnation is misrepresented. A doketic incarnation and a scriptural view of the Atonement are irreconcilable; and it were devoutly to be wished, when the currents of theological thought drift, as they sometimes do in the lapse of years, towards a forgetfulness of the actual humanity of Jesus, and towards a doketic death upon the cross, the manifest lessons of the soteriologic attempts of the Gnostics were recounted and laid to heart.

Now, it was in the mortal struggle with Gnosticism that it first became necessary for the leaders of the orthodox party to state exactly what they believed, and it was under the baneful shadow of Gnosticism that the first aspect of the Atonement elaborated was the relation of the death of Christ to the sway of Satan. Was it not inevitable that a one-sided investigation should lead to a one-sided and, subsequently, an erroneous theory? Even so early as the days of Irenæus, it was felt to be necessary to define with some precision the effect of the work of Christ upon the kingdom of Satan;[1] but redemption from the devil, which in Irenæus was the regaining by moral suasion of the power which the devil had obtained by force without possessing any valid right, becomes in Origen a payment to the devil of a ransom he may rightly claim. The conception, at any rate, which this greatest of the Theosophists, who have debased theology by accommodating it to corrupt philosophical theories, entertained concerning the redemption of man has been thus accurately described by a modern church historian: "The assumption from which Origen starts is the right which the devil has obtained over man by sin; this right necessitated a just arrangement with him: it involved, that is to say, that this right he had acquired should not be taken from him by force, but that he should receive as recompense for his loss something else equivalent, since only on this presupposition would he be willing to submit to the exchange. This ransom was the blood of Christ."[2] Now, this

[1] In his fifth book, *Contra Hæreses*, Irenæus writes: "The Mighty Word and True Man, redeeming us by His own blood in accordance with the dictates of right reason (*rationabiliter*), gave Himself as a ransom for those who had been taken captive; and since the kingdom of Satan (*apostasia*) unjustly ruled us, and since we were the subjects of God by nature, contrary to nature He has transferred our allegiance (*alienavit nos*), making us His own disciples: the Omnipotent Word of God, having no lack of justice in Himself, against the apostasy itself proceeded justly, redeeming His own from its power—not forcibly, as the apostasy did in the beginning, snatching with insatiable greed (*rapiens insatiabiliter*) things which did not belong to it, but by moral suasion (*secundum suadelam*), as became God, who would attain His desire by persuasion, and not by force, so that neither should justice be violated nor the original creation of God perish" (*Patrologiæ Græcæ* tom. vii. p. 1121).

[2] Baur, *Die christliche Lehre von der Versöhnung in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung von der ältesten Zeit bis auf die neueste*, 1838, pp. 47–49.

conception of the *lutron* of the New Testament, as a ransom paid to the devil for the liberation of man who was his lawful slave, became one of the most cherished views of the Church; and although it was staunchly and almost virulently opposed by men like Athanasius and Gregory Nazianzen, although in addition it must never be left out of sight, that in the very writers who stated it most grossly, it did not exclude other views upon the same subject;[1] nevertheless it cannot be denied that in popular preaching, as well as in more methodical theological inquiries, this was the view which in patristic and mediæval times most readily came to the front: it was prominently advocated, with more or less limitations, in the writings of Basil the Great, Ambrose, Leo the Great, Gregory the Great, Hugo St. Victor, Thomas Aquinas, and Bernard of Clairvaux, not to mention lesser names; and even those who ostensibly opposed it could not shake themselves free from its contaminating influence. Sometimes the theory was expressed so grossly as to imply that the conflict of Christ with the devil was maintained upon the ancient principle that deception or trickery, feint or falsehood, all was fair in war. Thus Gregory the Great likens the devil to the Behemoth of the Book of Job, who was hooked by the bait of the flesh of Christ; John Damascene finds a parallel to the blindness of the devil in the dog in the fable who dropped his meat to catch at its shadow; and several writers of a yet later date speak of the cross as a bird-snare or a mouse-trap.[2]

This bygone theory of a ransom paid to the devil, now relegated to the museums of the past as an equal curiosity with the theory of the universe founded upon the hypothesis

[1] Thus Origen dwells in many passages, as forcibly as Anselm, upon the character of the work of Christ viewed as the payment of a debt, and as forcibly as Jonathan Edwards upon the juridic aspect of the Atonement. Hence Ritschl, finding the first traces, as he says, of a thoroughgoing and exclusive theory in Anselm, commences his historical investigation in the first volume of his great work, *Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung* (Erster Band, 1870, "Die Geschichte der Lehre;" Zweiter Band, "Der biblische Stoff der Lehre," 1874; Dritter Band, "Die positive Entwickelung der Lehre," 1874), with the *Cur Deus Homo*.

[2] A careful statement of the historical course of this theory (including the three ideas of Satan's claim to payment, the delusions under which he accepted or rather exhorted it, and its necessity) will be found in Oxenham, pp. 143–150.

of four elements, was based upon two facts and two errors. It was perfectly true, as the Bible states, that there was a relation between the death of Christ and the empire of Satan; it was also true that the death of Christ is described in the Bible as a ransom; it is a misapprehension to allege that the Bible regards the devil as having any vested right in man, and equally a misapprehension to say that the ransom contemplated by the Scriptures was a ransom in the mitigation of a righteous claim on the part of the devil. Well might Gregory Nazianzen ask, "To whom was the ransom paid? To the evil one himself? Away with such a scandal! Then the robber would receive not *from* God merely, but God Himself as a ransom and exceeding rich reward for his tyranny!" The testimony of the New Testament is clear that the ransom paid was to the offended majesty of the Most High, not to any Satanic power. There are rare cases possibly in the New Testament where the conception of a λύτρον may refer to a monetary indemnity to be paid as the price of a slave. The idea of a λύτρον, as has been already shown, in some few cases signifies, like the Hebrew equivalent, the mere fact of deliverance, and a ransoming from the devil would in this case mean a deliverance from his power by any possible means: the idea, however, signifies in most cases the indemnity paid to God in satisfaction for wrong done, as in the case of the trespass-offerings and ransoms for the first-born under the old covenant. The figure of redemption called up in the minds of the apostles and their hearers the various redemptions of the Jewish law, not the associations of Roman society; the figure of ransom was drawn from the customs of the Tabernacle, not of the slave-mart. A knowledge of the details of the Jewish worship, and their intimate connection with the rites and doctrines of the Christian Church, would have saved the Church from the distortion and coarseness of the idea of indemnifying the devil. This theory, so far from being a complete induction from Scripture, is a perverse rendering of one of the facts which any complete induction should explain. That the rise of Christ as Saviour is the fall of Satan appears clearly on the pages of Holy Writ, as we have seen; the death of Christ has as one of its effects the victory

over the devil; but the New Testament nowhere says or implies that the death of Christ was a ransom paid to the Prince of this World.

From the death of Gregory the Great, the last of the Fathers, at the beginning of the seventh century of our era, *till Anselm* arose, at the close of the eleventh century, as the pioneer of Scholasticism, the *theology* of Western Christendom *slept*, it has been well said, "*her winter sleep*," and it is not surprising that the trance of theological science remained unbroken by any new theory of the Atonement. All interest in theology was for a while dead. With *Anselm*, however, theological problems again came into prominence, and the founder of Scholasticism, whose honour it was to write an epoch-making book upon Theism, also *wrote an epoch-making book upon the Atonement.* By Anselm an endeavour was again made to explain the relation between the death of Christ and the remission of sins by utilizing the biblical idea of ransom. Christ, taught Anselm, paid a ransom for us; that is to say, paid as our surety the debt we owed but could not ourselves pay: but Christ paid this debt, Anselm said, not to Satan, but to God. This theory of the famous successor of Lanfranc in the See of Canterbury, is assuredly an induction from Scripture, though an incomplete induction.

The problem Anselm placed before himself in his great treatise, which he adroitly called *Cur Deus Homo*, was to investigate the reason of the incarnation. He divides his work into two parts, in the first of which he deals with the objections of those who reject the Christian faith, and undertakes to demonstrate *remoto Christo . . . rationibus necessariis esse impossibile ullum hominem salvare sine illo*, —that is to say, that if there be no Christ, the salvation of any man is impossible; and in the second, "just as if nothing were known of Christ," he undertakes to prove "that human nature has been framed for this end, that the whole man, body and soul, might enjoy a blessed immortality: that this end must be accomplished, and must be accomplished by no other means than the incarnation and its consequences."[1] This inquiry he carries on in the form of dialogue *non tam*

[1] *Cur Deus Homo*, Præfatio.

ostendere, quam tecum quærere—for fellowship in investigation rather than dogmatizing. The main question is otherwise stated. Thus, in one place, Anselm writes that it is his desire to answer the query, whether emanating from an infidel or a believer, "with what reason and by what necessity God became man, and restored by His death, as is believed and confessed, life to the world, when this might have been done by some one else, whether by angel or man, or by a simple volition;"[1] or, as it is put elsewhere, "by what necessity and reason God, when He is omnipotent, took upon Himself the humiliation and weakness of human nature for our redemption?"[2] or, as the question is put in yet another place, "What righteousness is there in delivering the greatest man who ever lived to death on the sinner's behalf?"[3] and yet again it is proposed to inquire, "by what means the death of Christ can be rational and necessary."[4] It is evident, therefore, that whilst Anselm appears to propose to himself the solution of the purpose of the incarnation, he is in reality investigating the necessity of the cross; as he himself tersely says, "*Quærendum est igitur, qua ratione Deus dimittat peccata hominibus,*"—"The problem is this, by what method God remits the sins of men."[5] Anselm, after answering several subsidiary questions, proposes to reply by examining "what sin is," and "what it is to render satisfaction for sin." Sin is *debt*, says Anselm, and to render satisfaction for sin is to pay the debt due to the Almighty. To quote his own words: "If either angel or man always rendered to God what he owed, he would never sin: sin is therefore nothing else than to render to God His due: now the whole will of every rational creature ought to be subject to the will of God. This, then, is the debt which both angel and man owe to God, by paying which no one sins, and which every one who does not pay sins. This is justice or uprightness of will, which makes men just or upright in heart, in other words, in will; this is the sole and total honour which we owe to God, and which God requires of us: only such a will does deeds pleasant in the

[1] *Cur Deus Homo*, Book I. cap. i.
[2] *Ibid.* Book I. cap. ii.
[3] *Ibid.* Book I. cap. xviii.
[4] *Ibid.* Book I. cap. x.
[5] *Ibid.* Book I. cap. xi.

sight of God, when action is possible; and when it is not, the will itself is acceptable, because no deed can please without it. He who does not pay to God this debt of honour defrauds God of what is His own, and dishonours God, and this is to sin; and so long as what is taken is not paid, he remains a defaulter. Nor is it enough to restore what has been withheld, but because of the contumely inflicted more must be repaid: for as, when the health of any one is injured, to restore health without making some recompense for the pain that has been borne is an insufficient requital; so the violator of honour does not make adequate restitution, unless he repays proportionately to the irksomeness of the dishonour: so, then, every sinner is under the obligation of paying to God the honour he has deprived Him of, and this is the satisfaction which every sinner owes to God." [1] Having thus established that all sin is debt due to God, Anselm applies this conception to the elucidation of the catholic doctrine, and in detail substantiates the propositions,—that God cannot forgive sin, that is to say, forgive the debt due to His honour without a payment in full,—that the payment demanded must be commensurate with the sin,—that the lightest sin is incommensurable,—that man is a bankrupt debtor,—and that satisfaction can only be made by the incarnation of God and His free payment of all the dues of man.

In the history of Christian doctrine, the *Cur Deus Homo* takes its place with Butler's *Analogy*. As an apologetic substantiation of Christian belief, it was invaluable in the special religious circumstances of the days of William Rufus, and, from its steady and irresistible progress from the commonest elements of popular ethics and common sense to the distinctive features of the New Testament revelation, it may even render service to the modern sceptic; as a contribution to Christian doctrine, it is inconsequent and misleading. Valuable as it is to convince the unbeliever that all sin is a contraction of debt which must be paid sooner or later, to impart a similar conception to the believer is to erect a fleeting description into a satisfactory definition. Anselm's theory of the death of Christ is a serious and methodical and thoroughgoing explanation of

[1] *Cur Deus Homo*, Book I. cap. xi.

the sinner's relation to the Creator by the light of the Parable of the Talents, or of the lord who forgave his steward his monetary defalcation; but such an explanation, teeming with suggestiveness and instruction, so long as it is used simply as a figure, lands in perplexing contradiction immediately it is made to go on all fours. Anselm is himself to blame if the retort is so often made, that the readiest way for a creditor to cancel a debt is to forgive it unconditionally. The very difficulty in the whole question, besides, is elided in such a conception, for how comes it that the death of Christ defrays the debt due to the divine honour? To define sin as debt, is to introduce endless confusion into the discussion. The scriptural explanation is much more simple; for when it is said that death is the punishment decreed upon sin, and further, that the death of Christ is the vicarious endurance of that punishment in all its mystery by Him who was Himself sinless and the actual awarder of the punishment, whilst it is undoubtedly true that the one cardinal difficulty remains, of the validity of vicarious punishment, nevertheless minor confusions are not introduced into the theory. To the comprehension of the nature of sin Anselm contributed only a figure of speech by calling it debt; to the comprehension of the death of Christ he contributed an analogy simply by calling it the payment of debt. Anselm explains the death of Christ by the idea of ransom; the New Testament explains the idea of ransom by the death of Christ.

Anselm gave birth to the great age of Scholasticism, and *from Anselm's days to the days of the Reformation his influence upon the doctrine of the Atonement was very marked.* It is true that there was an occasional recurrence to the earlier view of the Atonement as satisfying the claims of Satan, as is seen, for example, in Bernard of Clairvaux and in Peter Lombard; but this survival was rare. For the most part, the Scholastic theology of the Atonement was very greatly influenced by Anselm's epoch-making book, the leading doctrinal writers either accepting or opposing Anselm's views; certainly they did not venture to ignore those views. *In fact, outside the narrow tenure of the older Patristic view, it may be said that the great Scholastics took sides for or against Anselm,* some

illustrating and amending Anselm's theory, and some advocating antagonistic doctrines. *Of the former, Thomas Aquinas is a good instance; of the latter, Duns Scotus and Abelard are the more prominent examples.*

The views of Aquinas on the Atonement are contained in Quæstiones 46–49 of the third part of his famous *Summa*. There he treats in order of the Passion of Christ,—the Passion itself, its efficient cause, its mode, and its fruits. We are only concerned with what Aquinas has to say concerning the mode of the Passion. Upon this mode St. Thomas asks and answers, in the Scholastic manner, six queries. They are these: Whether the sufferings of Christ have caused our salvation by their merit, or by their satisfaction, or by their sacrificial nature, or by their redemption? These are four of the queries; the remaining two are—Whether it is proper to Christ to be the Redeemer, and whether He has caused our salvation as its efficient cause? In his replies to these queries, Thomas shows that the manner in which the sufferings of Christ take effect on us is fourfold,—by merit, by satisfaction, by sacrifice, and by redemption: by merit, inasmuch as He imparts to all His members the grace He had merited for them; by satisfaction, seeing that the honour of God could not but be satisfied by the greatness of His dignity, sufferings, and love; by sacrifice, since the passion of Christ is the highest act of surrender ever offered to God; and by redemption, in that the passion redeems us from the bondage and punishment of sin. Manifestly, therefore, there is a wider survey in Thomas Aquinas than in Anselm; but manifestly, also, in the prominence given to satisfaction,—to satisfaction to God and His honour,—the influence of Anselm is very marked. This influence comes out strongly in Aquinas's definition of satisfaction, — satisfaction is the giving the offended party something he loves as much as he hates the offence, or, as Aquinas significantly adds, more; an addition of immense importance, as history has shown. According to the teaching of Aquinas, that is to say, the satisfaction Christ made by His sufferings for our sins was not only sufficient, it was much more than sufficient, it was superabundant; "the passion of Christ was not only a sufficient, but even a super-

abundant satisfaction for the sins of the human race" (*passio Christi non solum sufficiens sed etiam superabundans satisfactio pro peccatis humani generis*). A truth, doubtless, this *satisfactio superabundans*, but pushed by the followers of Aquinas to extreme issues.

Passing, however, from the views of those whose sympathies lay with Anselm, and whose aim, therefore, was to mature the views to which he had given expression, especially his views upon satisfaction, instances are found in Duns Scotus and Abelard of those who swung away from the Anselmic idea of satisfaction.

Duns Scotus repudiated the notion that the sufferings of Christ were a ransom, inasmuch as they paid the debt of the sinner to God. Duns Scotus adopted another analogy to explain the scriptural statements upon the death of Christ. Sin was debt, Duns said equally with Anselm, but by His death Jesus did not pay the sinner's debt. He said Jesus *acceptilated* it. Duns Scotus hoped to explain the Atonement by means of a technical relation between debtor and creditor, possible in Roman law. What Duns meant may be expressed as follows:—By a legal fiction termed *acceptation* or *acceptilation*, it was allowable to grant release from debt by cancelling the whole when part was paid, or even when no money at all changed hands. *Acceptilation* was thus the optional acceptance of little or nothing as something. Now, this legal idea was employed by Duns Scotus in his controversy with the Thomists to illustrate the significance of Christ's death. According to his view, the passion of Christ was not, as Aquinas had asserted, *sufficiens et superabundans satisfactio*,[1] "a sufficient and more than a sufficient satisfaction" for the sins of the world; the passion of Christ did not, as Aquinas had also argued, effect salvation *per modum efficientiæ*,[2] by its inherent merit, that is to say; the passion of Christ was a process of *acceptilation*, on which the Almighty in His infinite

[1] Aquinas, *Summa Theológica*, 3rd part, quæst. 48 (Migne's edition, vol. iv. pp. 445, 446).

[2] *Ibid.* vol. iv. pp. 450, 451. Aquinas has had the misfortune to be resorted to for phrases rather than arguments; his inquiries, for example, upon the sufferings of Christ are extremely large-hearted and broad-eyed, nevertheless it is by his *satisfactio superabundans* he is remembered.

benevolence is willing to regard as satisfaction for the infinite sin of man what in itself is assuredly not infinite. One passage from his *Commentary*, out of many which might be quoted, will suffice. In replying to the statement that the life and work of Christ had something of infinity about them which fitted them for annulling infinite sin and conferring infinite grace and glory, "I say," he writes, "that the merit of Christ was finite, because essentially dependent upon a finite beginning. . . . How then did that merit become of sufficient avail? I say that as every other gift of God is good because God has willed it, and not conversely, that thus the merit in question became just as great a good as it was taken for (*accceptabatur*), and that it was its acceptilation which constituted it so great a merit, and not conversely. . . . From its very form, this merit could not be received (*accceptari*) as an infinite fact, or for an infinite purpose, but for a finite. Nevertheless, from the circumstances of the case, there was a certain extrinsic reason why God could *acceptilate* it as an infinite fact, and employ it from its accompaniments for an infinite purpose; nor would there have been any congruity in acceptilation visible either in the reason for the deed or in the doer, if that merit had been attached to another person: the passion of Christ sufficed for just as many as God willed it should suffice (*acceptari*); still, as far as the acceptilation itself was concerned, it was neither regarded as infinite nor as in itself formally infinite."[1] What Duns Scotus intends his readers to understand then is, by all these subtle and almost untranslatable technicalities of scholasticism, that the sufferings of Christ achieved their stupendous results by the divine volition and not by inherent merit. The only criticism that is called for by such a theory is, that the New Testament never regards the death of Christ as a fancy value put upon the sin of man.

Duns Scotus was followed by William Occam, the Franciscan, and by the Nominalist School generally. Indeed, the virulent controversy which raged between the Thomists, the

[1] Joannes Duns Scotus, *In tres primos et in quartum Sententiarum Commentaria*, Book III. Dist. xix. Quæst. i. sec. 13 (vol. vii. p. 417, in the complete edition in twelve folios made by the Franciscan Wadding in 1639).

followers of Thomas Aquinas, and the Scotists, the followers of Duns Scotus, pertained to the doctrine of Atonement as well as to other points, and has lasted even to the present in the Church of Rome, the Thomist side being advocated by the Dominicans and Jesuits, and the Scotist side by the Franciscans. Expressed with all possible brevity, the Thomist theory has been called a theory of *acceptation*, or real satisfaction to law, and the Scotist a theory of *acceptilation* (putative satisfaction to law).

Abelard, on the other hand, in his recoil from Anselm, put away from himself altogether both the ideas of sin as debt and of death as ransom. In the view of Abelard, whom Roscellinus described as "ennobled beyond the generality of men by the sanctity of his life and the exceptional character of his doctrine," the death of Jesus affects man only, not God, and affects men by being an unparalleled exhibition of love.

The sentiments of Peter Abelard relative to the subject in hand will be most conveniently extracted from his *Exposition of Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, in the second book of which he deliberately sets himself to answer the question as to the nature of the redemption achieved by Christ. Having in the first place criticised and rejected the notion that the death on Calvary was a ransom paid to the devil, he proceeds to give in the following terms the true *solutio* to his *quæstio*: "Now it seems to us that in this we have been justified in the blood of Christ and reconciled to God, that by the agency of that unparalleled grace displayed towards us, in that His Son has undertaken our nature and endured even unto death whilst instructing us by word and example, He has bound us so much more closely to Himself by His love (*nos sibi amplius per amorem astrinxit*), that, inflamed by such a gift of divine grace, genuine love dreads the endurance of nothing for His sake; and in the believing expectation of this benefit, indeed, the ancient Fathers, we doubt not, were inflamed with the warmest love to God and man, since it is written: 'And they that went before, and they that followed, cried, saying, Hosanna; Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.' A most just man also, that is to say, one who loves God more, every man becomes after the passion of Christ,

because a benefit already accomplished arouses to a deeper love than one that is only hoped for. Our redemption therefore is that highest exhibition of love towards us, which not only frees us from the slavery of sin, but obtains for us the true liberty of the sons of God, in order that we may accomplish all things by love rather than by fear of Him, Who has displayed to us so great mercy, than which He Himself testifies a greater cannot be found: 'Greater love has no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.'"[1] The same sentiment is thus expressed in Abelard's *Epitome of Christian Theology:* "Side by side with His, all the torments of the martyrs are as nothing, and so none can compare with Him in suffering; and it is evident all this was done that He might show how great love He had to man, and so inflame man with a greater love in return."[2] The validity, therefore, of the death of Christ lay, in the opinion of Abelard, in the fact that it was a convincing exhibition of divine love.

Now, granting that the death of Christ is an exhibition of divine love, does it therefore follow that it is this and nothing more? Had Abelard asked himself such a question, he would have probably been led to see in the New Testament an additional element to that which he, it must be admitted, so forcibly delineated. And yet this is far from certain: for it would appear as if Abelard had projected his own affectionate and benevolent nature—wanting lamentably, one cannot but confess, in the sterner and nobler attributes of character, unflinching uprightness and discriminating justice—into the heavenly world, and represented Deity as such an one as himself, spontaneously forgiving without prior or ulterior examination, and loving to a fault. The love of God and the love of Christ have assuredly not been left out of sight in the previous discussion upon the scriptural doctrine of Atonement, but these moments alone have been seen to be an insufficient analysis of the divine action as revealed by the apostles. Inflexible righteousness had its account to settle as well as

[1] Abelard, *Expositio in Epist. Pauli ad Romanos*, Book II. (Migne's edition, p. 836).

[2] *Epitome Theologicæ Christianæ*, cap. xxv. (Migne's edition, p. 1731).

magnanimous love. The theory of Abelard is an attempt to explain the Atonement by one element in its necessity. However, it should be stated that Abelard's treatment of this doctrine is not strictly consistent, seeing that it would not be difficult to quote from his writings passages of altogether an Anselmic tinge.

Abelard's moral-influence theory was also advocated strongly by his intimate friend, the famous Robert Pulleyne of Oxford.

Thus, then, looking at the Scholastic period as a whole, it is evident that there had come to be, as there has usually been since, three prominent tendencies in formulating the doctrine of the Atonement, viz. the tendency to extrude the idea of satisfaction to holiness, and to substitute a moral-influence theory, as in Abelard,—the tendency to see in the death of Jesus an accommodation to righteousness, one form of the so-called governmental theory, as in Duns Scotus,—and the tendency to keep constantly in view the satisfaction to the divine holiness, the so-called satisfaction theory, so clearly seen throughout the discussion of Anselm whatever its aberrations.

From the history of the doctrine in the Scholastic age, let us pass on to *the history in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.*

The Reformers themselves, Luther and Melanchthon, Zwingli and Calvin, *were rather occupied with the doctrine of justification than that of redemption,* with the manner in which salvation was appropriated by man rather than with the manner in which salvation was obtained by Jesus. Their battlefield was the doctrine of Justification,—whether it was gradual or instantaneous, whether it was mediated by the priest or imparted directly to the sinner, whether it was assimilated by faith or by works. Hence it happens that the views of Luther, say, or Calvin, on the nature of the Atonement have to be gathered from incidental references to the doctrine of Justification. In fact, the remarks of the Reformers upon this matter are of a very general kind. For example, Calvin expresses himself thus: "When we say that favour was procured for us by the merit of Christ, we mean this, that by His blood we have been cleansed, and that His death was an expiation of our sins;" or he writes thus: "This I take for

granted, that if Christ satisfied for our sins, if He suffered the punishment due to us, if by His obedience he propitiated God, if, in fine, He, the just, suffered for the unjust, then salvation was procured by His righteousness for us, which is equivalent to our having merited it."[1] Statements so general might be made by any one holding any form of the theory of satisfaction.[2]

Immediately, however, it became necessary, as it speedily did, for the Protestant Churches to demonstrate that their views on Christian doctrine formed a complete system of thought, the doctrine of the atoning work of Christ had to be carefully and systematically formulated. Further, the system of Calvin being manifestly the most logical and thorough-going elaboration of the truths proclaimed by the Reformers, —the momentous truths, that is to say, of the supremacy of Scripture, of the universality of the Christian priesthood, and of justification by faith, — and the Calvinist system being widely received in all the Protestant Churches outside the Lutheran, naturally enough it was not long before a definite view was framed of the *modus operandi* of the death of Christ, a view which appeared to its advocates to at once harmonize with the Calvinist system itself, and summarize the substance of scriptural teaching. *Soon a rigid doctrine of Atonement came to be current among the Calvinist Churches on the Continent and in this country*, a doctrine most intimately associated with a limited atonement. Not only was it maintained that, as the Helvetic formula declares, Christ became "sponsor for those alone who by eternal election had been given to Him, . . . and them alone did He reconcile unto God," but the view was avowed in so many words that there was a transference of the sins of the elect to Christ, that Christ actually suffered the same penalties the elect should have suffered, including the pains of hell, and that thus Christ redeemed the elect. This is *the theory of the Hyper-Calvinists*, according to which Christ ransomed the elect by the payment of the debt they owed, the price paid being the exact amount of debt incurred by the elect. In short, what our Lord rendered for sinners was strictly a *quid pro quo* of punishment.

[1] *Christianæ Religionis Institutio*, Lib. II. cap. xvii. 4.

[2] Comp. Lindsay Alexander, *A System of Biblical Theology*, vol. ii. p. 103.

That the death of Christ was in some sense substitutionary appeared, as we have seen, on the face of Scripture. But the important question is, In what sense is the death of Christ substitutionary? Why was it that the death of Christ availed in substitution of the death of the elect? The Hyper-Calvinist reply, the reply of the great Calvinist theologians of the seventeenth century, was, as has just been said, as precise as simple. The death of Christ, they said, was substitutionary in the strictest sense. All the pains which the saved would otherwise have had to bear for themselves, Christ has in our stead actually and circumstantially borne.

The reply was not without its difficulties. The reply naturally gave birth to Antinomianism; for, if the sins of the saved are all punished in Christ, the saved owe nothing to law. To say with the Calvinists of the Synod of Dort: "This death of the Son of God is a single and most perfect sacrifice and satisfaction for sins, of infinite value and price, abundantly sufficient to expiate the sins of the whole world; but because many who are called by the gospel do not repent, nor believe in Christ, but perish in unbelief, this doctrine does not arise from defect or insufficiency of the sacrifice offered by Christ upon the cross, but from their own fault;"—so to say, in asserting the uniqueness and efficacy of Christ's death, is one thing; to define that uniqueness and efficacy as resulting from the endurance of all the pains, including the pangs of hell, which otherwise would have been suffered by the entire body of the elect, is quite another thing. Such a view is not demanded by Scripture; nay, it contradicts other Scripture doctrines, such as those of the conditionality of salvation upon faith and upon obedience. What Scripture says is, that Christ died for our sins, the pain of death consisting in conscious divine withdrawal. If this is all that is meant by the pangs of hell, well and good.

Perhaps the best, because the most cultured and moderate expression of this Hyper-Calvinist theory, is to be found in John Owen's writings. His discourse, for instance, in reply to Baxter, entitled, *Of the Death of Christ, the Price He paid, and the Purchase He made*,[1] professedly deals with the points before us.

[1] Gould's edition of Owen's Works, vol. x. pp. 429–449.

Dr. Owen states his purpose to be an inquiry into "the true nature of the satisfaction of Christ, with the kind of payment of our debt by Him made and accomplished." Is the payment, he asks, made for sin by the blood of Jesus *ejusdem* or *tantidem?* as he technically puts the question,—of the same nature, or of a nature equivalent. "The assertion which alone I seek to maintain is this," Owen says, "that the punishment which our Saviour underwent was the same which the law required of us, God relaxing His law as to the person suffering, but not as to the penalty suffered."

The reasons advanced by Owen for this view are as follows:—

1. "The Scripture hath expressly revealed the translation of punishment in respect of the subjects suffering it, but hath not spoken one word of the change of the kind of punishment, but rather the contrary is affirmed: Rom. viii. 32, 'He spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all.'" But this does not touch the real point at issue as between *ejusdem* and *tantidem.*

2. "All the punishment due to us was contained in the curse and the sanction of the law, that is, the penalty of the obligation whereof we speak. But this was undergone by the Lord Jesus Christ, for 'He hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.'" But this, again, does not touch the question as between identical and equivalent penalty.

3. "Where God condemneth sin, there He condemns it in that very punishment which is due unto it in the sinner, or rather to the sinner for it. He hath revealed but one rule of His proceeding in this case. Now, He condemned sin in the flesh of Christ: Rom. viii. 3, 'God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh.' The condemning of sin is the infliction of punishment due to sin." But here, again, the fact is not touched, that the infliction of an equivalent penalty would equally be the condemning of sin.

4. "'The whole penalty of sin is death,' Gen. ii. 17. This Christ underwent for us: Heb. ii. 9, 'He tasted death.' It is true this death may be considered either in respect to its

essence, which is called 'the pains of hell' which Christ underwent, Ps. xvi. 3, xxii. 1, Luke xxii. 44, or of its attendances, as duration and the like, which He could not undergo, Ps. xvi. 8–11; Acts ii. 24–28. So that whereas eternal death may be considered two ways, either as such *in potentia* and in its own nature, or as actually, so our Saviour underwent it not in the latter, but first sense, which by the dignity of His person, which raises the estimation of punishment, is *æquipotent* to the other." But æquipotent is equivalent, and equivalent is *tantidem*, not *ejusdem*.

5. "In the meeting of our iniquities upon Christ, Isa. liii. 6, and His being thereby made sin for us, 2 Cor. v. 21, lay the very punishment of our sin, as to us threatened, upon Him." But advocates for *tantidem* could say just the same.

6. "Consider the scriptural description," Owen adds in conclusion, "you have of His perpessions, and see if they do not plainly hold out the utmost that ever was threatened to sin." In illustration, Dr. Owen instances the "wounds" and "stripes" of Isaiah, the "exceeding sorrowful unto death" of Matthew, the "sore amazed" and "very disquieted" of Mark, the "drops of blood" of Luke, and the cry, "Why hast Thou forsaken me?" and adds, "Certainly His inconceivable sufferings were in another kind, and such as set no example to any of His to suffer in aftertime." But the point is the identity of the sufferings of Christ with the sufferings to be suffered by sinners; that the sufferings of Christ were stupendous and unparalleled the advocates of *tantidem* aver as strongly as the advocates of *ejusdem*. The above instances decide nothing either way.

These statements of Owen's present clearly and with tolerable conciseness the views held by the Puritans and the early Nonconformists regarding the *modus operandi* of the death of Christ for human sin. The death of Christ, they said, redeemed the elect from sin, because in dying Christ bore the very pains of sin which the elect themselves should have borne, including the pangs of hell; a view, let it be said again, not without its truth, as an examination of the biblical doctrine of Atonement has shown. For Christ died for our sins, and death meant Divine withdrawal. But, as we

have also seen, the death of Christ was conditioned by the person of Christ, the Deity of Jesus at once accentuating and changing the pains of death. Christ did not suffer the long evolution of death, but in one supreme hour suffered death's supremest agony.

Nor did the Hyper-Calvinist theory stop at Owen's position. By some the commercial character was carried still further, and the idea of an exact exchange of man's sins and Christ's righteousness was averred. Christ, it was said, took man's sin and became a sinner; whereas man took Christ's righteousness and became Christ-like. The principal representative of this school was Dr. Crisp, a minister at Brinkworth in Wiltshire, about the middle of the seventeenth century, and it numbers Chauncy, Saltmarsh, and Gill among its adherents. Thus Dr. Crisp did not hesitate to say, "Hast thou been an idolater, hast thou been a murderer, an adulterer, a thief, a liar, a drunkard? If thou hast part in the Lord, all these transgressions of thine became actually the transgressions of Christ;" and again, he does not hesitate to say, "That very sinfulness that we were, Christ is made that sinfulness before God;" and hence he does not hesitate to add, "Here is a direct change—Christ takes our person and condition, and stands in our stead; we take Christ's person and condition, and stand in His stead." Even Dr. Owen raised his voice against such extreme views. Indeed, as Dr. Alexander has reminded us, "By the great body of English Nonconformists these views have been, and continue to be, repudiated. Bates, Howe, Alsop, along with many other very decided Calvinists, joined at the time in denouncing them as unscriptural and dangerous; and in later times the vigorous pen of Andrew Fuller — not to mention less famous names — was employed in exposing them and advocating Calvinistic views apart from them."[1]

In the treatment of these doctrinal developments, it is not desirable to keep to the strict chronological order, for then, as ever, pronounced views on one side soon gave rise to antagonistic views, and even the more mature expression of opinion upon one side often owed much of precision and carefulness

[1] *System of Biblical Theology*, vol. ii. p. 105.

to opponent opinion. Dr. Owen, for example, states his views with greater care than his predecessors, not improbably because of his acquaintance with the writings of Socinus and Grotius, attacking the extreme Calvinistic opinions. Order of thought is almost more essential than order of time in such an inquiry as this, and in the order of thought *the next important phase in the development of the doctrine of Atonement is the modification soon after introduced into the Hyper-Calvinist opinion.* Calvinist opinion soon passed from the *ejusdem* to the *tantidem*, and declared that the sufferings of Christ availed for salvation, inasmuch as these sufferings presented to the Divine Majesty not the same sufferings as those due to the elect, but sufferings equivalent thereto. Stated at more length, this modified Hyper-Calvinist view is as follows. Sin, the theory holds, is a violation of the divine honour, and as committed against an infinite Being, deserves an infinite punishment. Sin being such, the majesty of God requires Him to execute punishment upon the sinner, while the love of God pleads for forgiveness. This conflict of attributes is eternally reconciled by the voluntary death of the God-man, —who, by virtue of the dignity of His Person, bears the punishment of sin which must otherwise have been suffered eternally by sinners. Indeed, this suffering of the God-man presents to the Divine Majesty an exact equivalent for the deserved sufferings of the elect. Therefore, as a result of this vicarious satisfaction, the elect are pardoned and regenerated. A quotation from Dr. Shedd will put the view sharply: "Equivalency," he says, "not identity, is the characteristic of vicarious penalty. The exchange implied in the term substitution is of quality, not quantity. One kind of judicial suffering—that is, suffering endured for the purpose of satisfying justice—is substituted for another kind. Christ's sufferings were of a different nature or quality from those of a lost man. . . . Vicarious penalty, then, is the substitution of an equal *quantity*, but a *different quality*, of suffering. The Mediator suffers differently from the lost world of sinners, but He suffers equally. Equivalency satisfies justice as completely as identity. One hundred dollars in gold extinguishes a debt of one hundred dollars as completely as does one hundred

dollars in silver." [1] This modified Hyper-Calvinist view has been held by many theologians in Great Britain and America, having been advocated, for instance, by R. S. Candlish,[2] Dewar,[3] Hugh Martin,[4] Smeaton,[5] and Crawford,[6] and by Jonathan Edwards,[7] the elder Charles Hodge,[8] A. A. Hodge,[9] and latest and fullest by Cochrane.[10] Judged, however, by the scriptural doctrine of Atonement, may it not be said, first, that this theory is open to the objections previously raised against defining sin as debt; second, that, contrary to Scripture, it limits atonement to the elect; third, that it is open to the objection that, if the debt of the elect is paid, the elect are above law; fourth, that it does not distinguish sufficiently between Christ's work for us (related to sin as transgression), and Christ's work in us (related to sin as depravity); and lastly, that this view as to the suffering of equivalent pain is not demanded by the New Testament statements?

Not pursuing, for the moment, the development of the Calvinist theories, it seems *necessary* just here *to note that* as Duns Scotus and Abelard recoiled from Anselm, so *a recoil took place against the Post-Reformation doctrines,* and a recoil *of a two-fold kind,* the more extreme *as seen in the Socinian theories,* and the less extreme *as seen in the several Arminian theories.*

The rejection by Socinus and his followers of the doctrine of the Deity of Jesus, of course, involved an entire remodelling of theology, and, amongst other changes, an entire remodelling of the doctrine of the Atonement. For, in the Anselmic theory and in all its offshoots, strong importance pertains to the Person of the Redeemer as imparting value to His sufferings

[1] *Dogmatic Theology,* vol. ii. 455.

[2] *The Atonement, its Efficacy and Extent.*

[3] *The Atonement, its Nature, Reality, and Efficacy.*

[4] *The Atonement in its Relation to the Covenant, the Priesthood, the Intercession of our Lord.*

[5] *The Doctrine of the Atonement as taught by Christ and as taught by the Apostles.*

[6] *The Doctrine of Holy Scripture respecting the Atonement.*

[7] *Essay concerning the Necessity and Reasonableness of the Christian Doctrine of Satisfaction for Sin.*

[8] *Systematic Theology.* [9] *The Atonement.*

[10] *The Moral System and the Atonement,* 1889, Oberlin, Ohio.

for man. Naturally, therefore, the denial of the Deity of Jesus necessitated another mode of interpreting the death on Calvary; and Socinus was but acting under the compulsion of his Unitarian views when he set himself to destroy, by reasoning, the idea of substitution of any kind, to explain away the scriptural basis of substitution, and to point out what seemed to him a truer view of the influence of the death of Jesus.

If history demonstrates the impossibility of holding a scriptural view of the Atonement side by side with a doketic conception of the humanity of Jesus, it as clearly shows that a disbelief in His divinity is as entangling an opinion. Anti-trinitarians have existed in all Christian times, producing in the Ante-Nicene period such notorious errors as the Ebionite, Sabellian, Monarchian, and Arian heresies, and in later times Socinianism and modern Unitarianism; and have uttered their loud and persistent protest against *θεολογεῖν τὸν Χριστόν*, "beclouding the character and work of Jesus by theological distinctions." Now, with the detailed history and criticism of so-called Unitarianism we have not to do; we simply wish to draw attention to the fact that, concurrently with a discrediting of the divinity of Jesus, there has always existed an insufficiently scriptural view of the Atonement. The rejection of the dogma of the Theanthropos has always involved an entire remodelling of theology, and, amongst other doctrines, of that of the Atonement. All idea of death, in the scriptural sense, as the vicarious endurance of the punishment divinely decreed upon sin is passed over, and, as a necessary consequence, stress is laid upon other aspects of Christ's life and work, in order to account for His astounding influence. Rejection upon any grounds of the divinity of Jesus has invariably tended to the rejection of the paramount import of His death in the remission of sins. As a matter of fact, Unitarian theologians of pronounced views, or those theologians who are affected by that subtle and interpenetrating atmosphere of Unitarianism which pervades the whole area of the Church at certain epochs, have been the great exponents of what have been called, for want of a better word, *moral* theories of the

Atonement,—theories, that is to say, which rely for their proof upon the common principles of ethics rather than upon theology, *moral-influence theories*,—and in the requisite reconstruction have had recourse now to the supereminence of Christ as a teacher, and now to His exaltation as a martyr, at one time to His unparalleled and attractive love, and at another to His stern and rigid moral example. The scriptural doctrine of the Atonement stands or falls with the acceptance of its several moments; reject that of the divinity of Jesus, and history has always shown that the scriptural conception of the death of Christ has been invariably rejected too,—all sorts of hypotheses being advanced to render intelligible in any degree the stupendous effects wrought by Jesus upon the hearts and consciences of men. If detailed proof were essential, it would abundantly suffice to examine the doctrinal efforts, by far the most complete and scholar-like the Anti-trinitarian school has produced, of that self-denying and indefatigable brotherhood which established itself in the sixteenth century in the Polish Palatinate; adhesion to the fundamental principle of Fausto Sozzini—a change, that is to say, in theology proper or the doctrine of God—would be then seen to involve changes in the current anthropology, soteriology, ecclesiology, and eschatology, so completely do the scriptural doctrines stand or fall together; and yet it would be also seen that in the enforced reconstruction of the doctrine of the work of Christ, with all the exegetic pliancy and laborious criticism of a Sozzini, a Crell, and a Schlichting, the impression is most vividly left upon the mind that the several Socinian doctrines are inharmonious, their quotations are one-sided, their interpretations strained, and their criticism based for the most part upon misconception.[1] Where Socinus failed, who, with the same postulates, shall succeed? The several Anti-trinitarian theories are so

[1] See the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum qui Unitarii appellantur, continens opera omnia Johannis Crellii Francii, Ludovici Wolsogenii, Fausti Socini Senensis et Exegetica Jonæ Schlichtingii a Bucoviec*, Irenopoli 1656, the first volume of which contains the exegetic and didactic works of Socinus, and the second the polemic. The views of Socinus upon the Atonement are to be found in the *Prælectiones Theologicæ*, vol. i. pp. 537–600, or in polemic form in, possibly his finest work, *De Jesu Servatore*. John Crell wrote a defence of

many crucial experiments which demonstrate the inevitableness of eliding much of the express testimony of Scripture, if the scriptural doctrine of the Person of Christ be insufficiently seized.

The Socinian view, then, of the *modus operandi* of the death of Christ is, that the death of Jesus set before men an example for their imitation, an example of such a nature that it at once attracts men to God, and confirms the divine promises of forgiveness. In fact, according to the Socinian view, the sin in man is the sole barrier between man and God. It is man, the theory says, and not God, who needs to be reconciled. Man's salvation is to be effected by his own will, by repentance and reformation. To aid man in his struggle against sin, Christ lived a moral life and died a martyr death, giving thus so splendid an example of human fidelity to truth and duty as to powerfully spur man to imitation.

That such a theory, however, of the death of Jesus in no way harmonizes with the biblical data is evident. For this Socinian theory ignores, not only the scriptural doctrine of the Deity of Jesus, but the scriptural doctrines of Sacrifice and Atonement, sacrifice and atonement being made to God and not to man. Further, this theory affords no explanation of the unmartyrlike anguish on the cross. Again, whilst noting the defilement of sin as depravity, the theory ignores the guilt of sin as transgression. Nor must we forget that if Christ died as a martyr, such a death would be a measureless injustice on the part of God; for, as Henry Rogers so justly said, the sufferings of Christ "have a double aspect;" they affect our apprehension of Him who appointed them no less than of Him by whom they were endured, and give us but little encouragement to trust in the equity and benignity of the divine administration which thus visits perfect innocence with deeper woes than the foulest guilt in the world was ever sub-

the *De Servatore*, which is included in the same edition. Schlichting was the great exegete of the school, and scattered throughout his *Commentary upon the New Testament* are numerous investigations of the subject in hand. A brief statement of the Socinian views upon the Atonement will be found in the Racovian Catechism, *Christianæ Religionis brevissima institutio per interrogationes et responsiones*, Quæst. 377, etc.

ject. Well may Henry Rogers add: "On such a theory of the divine administration, the death of Christ is to me the darkest blot on the divine government,—the most melancholy and perplexing phenomenon of the universe, — the most gratuitous *apparent* departure from rectitude and equity with which the spectacle of the divine conduct presents us."[1] In a sentence, let any one read carefully through once more what the New Testament has to say upon the necessity, nature, mode, and effects of the death of Christ, as catalogued in the preceding chapter, and he will soon see that if he accepts Socinus he must reject Scripture.

The Arminians also, recoiling from the Hyper-Calvinistic position, found it necessary to consider the doctrine of Atonement from their Anti-predestinarian standpoint. They endeavoured to take up an intermediate position between the Socinians and Calvinists. Indeed, from the great school of Arminian theologians, which has numbered in its ranks such men as Jacob Arminius, Simon Episcopius, Hugo Grotius, Stephen Curcellæus, and Philip von Limborch, have emanated two distinct contributions to the doctrine of the Atonement, viz. the Governmental Theory of Grotius, and the Sacrifice Theory of Curcellæus and Limborch.

According to Grotius,[2] Christ did not bear in our stead the exact punishment due to sinners, nor did He bear an equivalent punishment, but He bore such a punishment as fulfilled the ends of moral government; such a punishment, that is to say, as produced sufficient moral impression to prevent a light regard of sin, an important truth being thus hinted at, although expressed by Grotius too baldly.

Why did Christ suffer? Grotius asked; and answered, first, that it is unscriptural to say with Socinus that Christ died as a martyr; and, second, that it is not required by Scripture that we should regard the death of Christ as a substitutionary bearing of the very punishment due to all sinners.

[1] *Selections from the Correspondence of R. E. H. Greyson, Esq.* Edited by the Author of *The Eclipse of Faith.* Vol. i. pp. 304, 305, Letter liv.

[2] A good translation of Grotius by Frank Hugh Foster was published at Andover, U.S. America, 1889,—*A Defence of the Catholic Faith concerning the Satisfaction of Christ against Faustus Socinus, by Hugo Grotius.*

For what, he asks, is the object of punishment? Punishment is not, he says, vindictive, but vindicative; it is not the infliction of so much pain, as such, in return for so much sin, without ulterior purpose; punishment is the infliction of pain with a very decided intention, an intention to maintain the divine authority. The anger of God is a judicial anger, and punishment marks the indignation of a righteous ruler. Further, thought Grotius, the prerogative of effecting the ends of punishment by any other means than punishment belongs to God as the Ruler of the universe. If by any means other than the actual infliction of the punishment due to the guilty, the Supreme Ruler can at once forgive the sinner, and uphold the majesty of moral law, He may certainly use those means. Now the death of Jesus, in the view of Grotius, was the means devised by the Divine Ruler for compelling recognition of the imperative necessity for holiness. Surely an invaluable thought, although worked out by Grotius with many perilous additions. But let us turn to the very words of Grotius.

In his learned and clear *Defensio Fidei Catholicæ de Satisfactione Christi*, the distinguished jurist, who is better known as the author of the famous treatise, *De Jure Belli et Pacis*, from the publication of which dates the modern conception of international law, undertook to defend the catholic doctrine of the Atonement from the animadversions of Socinus. Grotius commences his treatise by a succinct and laudable statement of the orthodox doctrine, which he enunciates as follows: "The catholic doctrine is this: God, moved by His goodness to confer a signal benefit upon us, but restrained by our sins which deserved to be punished, determined that Christ, Himself a willing agent because of His love to mankind, by submitting to most excruciating tortures and an ignominious death, should bear the punishment of our sins, in order that we, by the exercise of genuine faith, the divine justice being clearly displayed, might be freed from the penalty of eternal death."[1] This summarized statement Grotius proceeds to expand into the following moments: God is the primary

[1] *Defensio Fidei*, cap. i.; Pitt's complete edition of the works of Grotius, 1679, vol. iv. p. 297.

efficient cause in this redemption, being moved by His own pity and our sins, which merited punishment; Christ is the second efficient cause, being moved by His great love; the fact itself insisted on (*materia*) is the series of pains previous to death and the death itself; the intention referred to (*forma*) is the payment of the punishment due to our sins; death is the destruction of the person of Christ, consisting of body and soul; the purpose is the demonstration of the divine justice and the remission of our sins,—that is to say, the releasing us from their punishment. Having thus formulated the doctrine he purposes to defend in a most unexceptionably scriptural manner, Grotius advances to the task of substantiation; and an examination of the method employed shows that he relied for his defence upon two lines of argument, the one, the statements of Scripture, and the other, legal analogy. Upon the former method we need say no more; it is in the latter that false ideas arose. In his second chapter, entitled, "How God is to be thought of in this matter," Grotius proceeds: "The state of the controversy being understood, and that opinion being confirmed from the Scriptures, upon which the faith of the Church rests, to destroy the objection which his reason, or, to speak the truth, his abuse of reason, has suggested to Socinus, it is of the first importance to understand what part or office God has in the matter in question. Socinus confesses His part is with liberation from punishment, we would add that He has to do with the infliction of punishment; whence it follows that God must be regarded as a Ruler (*Rectorem*): for to inflict punishment, or to release any one you might punish from his penalty, which the Scriptures call *justifying*, is primarily and necessarily the function of a ruler as such (*non est nisi Rectoris qua talis primo et per se*); as, for example, the function of a father in the family, a king in the State, a Deity in the universe." "Now, since God is to be regarded as a Ruler," Grotius continues in the next chapter, "this act of His is an act of jurisdiction *generaliter dictæ*." Of what nature, then, it must be asked, is this act of jurisdiction? It is a relaxation, is the reply, of the penal law at the will of the Ruler: "The question may be here asked, whether that penal law may be relaxed? For there are some laws which

cannot be relaxed (*irrelaxabiles*) either absolutely or ἐξ ὑποθέσεως (hypothetically). Those which are absolutely irrelaxable are such as are addressed to things irreversibly wicked, as, for example, the law against perjury or against bearing false witness against a neighbour; for just as we say that God cannot lie and cannot deny Himself, so we may no less rightly say that God cannot do, or approve, or grant legal rights to actions inherently wicked. Laws are hypothetically relaxable which are concerned with some definite decree which the Scripture calls τῆς βουλῆς ἀμετάθετον (immutable in counsel), or ἀμετανόητον (not to be repented of); such a law is that concerning the condemnation of those who do not believe in Christ. But all positive laws are relaxable, nor may we betake ourselves to a hypothetical necessity for a distinct decree, where no mark of any such decree exists. But some fear lest to concede such a thing is to injure God by making Him mutable—they are much mistaken; for law is not something inherent in God, nor is it the will of God,—law is an effect of His will (*nam lex non est aliquid internum in Deo aut ipsa Dei voluntas, sed voluntatis quidam effectus*): but the effects of the divine will are most certainly mutable."[1] Hence it appears that the positive and penal law of God may be put aside, in the esteem of Grotius. And so he distinctly adds; with the proviso, that it be not relaxed either easily or upon a light occasion. "But," he concludes, "there was a most weighty reason, since the whole human race had lapsed into sin, for relaxing the law; for if all sinners were to be delivered to eternal death, there would utterly perish from the earth two most beautiful things, human adoration of God, and divine beneficence to man." Thus, according to Grotius, the death of Christ effects the salvation of man by a process of *relaxation of law;* it was not Socinus, as Grotius urged, that had relapsed into the Scotist notion of *acceptilation,* but Grotius himself in a more subtle form.

As a statement of scriptural doctrine, the *Defensio Fidei* was most powerful; it also had considerable weight as an apologetic reply to Socinus, from its strong insistence upon the Rectoral attributes of the Deity: it is only when we approach

[1] Pitt's edition, vol. iv. pp. 310, 311.

its deliberate contribution to the apprehension of the biblical statements that fault must be found. What the Bible says is, that the death of Christ was an actual submission to the punishment of death decreed upon sin; that is to say, if the legal analogy be adopted, there was no *relaxation* of law; the forgiveness of man was not a judicial remission of punishment in consideration of some recognition made of the majesty of the law, but in consideration of a complete recognition; the forgiveness of the prisoner was not a verdict of guilty, which was, because of the recommendation of the prosecutor who has been made to suffer, virtually an acquittal; the forgiveness of the New Testament is a consequence of the actual submission of the prosecutor to the punishment due to the prisoner.

Limborch resorted to yet another analogy to explain the current doctrine of the Church: that of the Jewish sacrifices: in his view, the death of Christ was a sacramental act, achieving, by the divine mercy, results incommensurate with its inherent power. "Some speak," he writes, "of the satisfaction of Christ, by which He has released us from all the pains due to our sins, and by bearing and exhausting them has satisfied the divine justice; but this sentiment has no foundation in Scripture (*sic*): for" (to give one reason out of many he advances) "the death of Christ is called a sacrifice for sin, and sacrifices are not payments of debts, nor plenary satisfactions for sins, but a gratuitous remission of sins is granted on their completion" (*illis peractis conceditur gratuita peccato remissio*).[1] This conception Limborch subsequently expands as follows: "There remains, then, our own opinion, that is, that Jesus Christ was a true sacrifice for our sins, and was rightly so called. . . . But you may ask, How comes it that a single victim sufficed for the expiation of so many myriads of men and their sons? See: one victim sufficed for two reasons; the one is, the divine will, which required for the liberation of the human race nothing more than this single victim. For it is the inalienable right of the Almighty to declare with what price He will rest satisfied. And, indeed, if animal victims could suffice by the will of God under the Old Testament for the expiation of those lesser

[1] *Theologia Christiana*, 3rd ed. p. 255.

crimes of the people, for the expiation of which God admitted sacrifices at that time; and if, especially, those two goats (Lev. xvi.), the one of which, after the imposition of the high priest's hands, was sent out into the desert, and the other was slain, and its blood carried by the high priest into the Holy of Holies, sufficed for bearing away and expiating the sins of the people committed throughout a whole year, why should not the blood of Jesus Christ also suffice, by the same divine will, for expiating all the sins of the whole world? A second reason is, the dignity of the person of Jesus Christ, who is the Son of God, verily God over all things, blessed for ever."[1] By the action of the divine will, therefore, it was the opinion of Limborch, who in this followed Grotius, the death of Christ, which possessed only an analogous potency to that of the Old Testament sacrifices, became sacramentally equal to the great and stupendous work attributed to it. The same view is adopted by Curcellæus: "Christ," said he, "did not make satisfaction by enduring the punishment which we sinners merited. This is not the nature of a sacrifice, and has nothing in common with it; for sacrifices are not payments of debts, as is manifest from those offered under the Law. The victims that were slain for transgressors did not expiate the punishment which they merited, nor was their blood a sufficient λύτρον for the soul of man. But they were oblations only by which the transgressor endeavoured to incline the mind of God to compassion, and to obtain remission from Him. Hence the formula in the Law applied to those who had expiated their sins by offering a sacrifice: 'And it shall be forgiven them.'"[2]

That such a view of the significance of sacrificial terminology, as applied to the death of Christ, is unscriptural, this whole book demonstrates. If many have erred in confining their study of sacrifice to the salient points of the New Testament, the Arminians have erred by restricting their investigations to the salient features of the Old Testament. And not to them with any care, or they would have observed the difficulty arising from numerous difficult points in the sacrificial worship of the Old Testament which were un-

[1] *Theologia Christiana*, 3rd ed. p. 258.
[2] *Institutio Religionis Christianæ*, Book V. cap. xix. 15.

resolved and unresolvable until the coming of Christ; and they would also have appreciated the great difficulty in precisely apprehending the nature of Christ's death from a sacrificial standpoint, because of the variety of sacrificial figures applied to it. Further, it is directly opposed to the teaching of the apostles, that the death of Christ possessed simply a sacramental efficacy. Limborch and Curcellæus are forcible illustrations of that vice, which has so largely impeded the progress of the doctrine of the Atonement, of mistaking faint analogy for valid inference.

To the wise all history is the biography of their own minds, and the history of doctrine displays as vividly as political history the tendencies to error which are latent in us all; and it were well if every man who betakes himself to this special study were to view his fleeting opinions and half-expressed tendencies in the cold light of history, and thus decide for himself dispassionately and thoroughly, first, the limits of the authority of Scripture, and next, the compatibility of his evanescent or more lasting opinions with that ultimate authority; for not a little of modern perplexity still arises from semi-latent leanings towards viewing the work of Christ under some figure of speech like *ransom*, or *debt*, or *acceptilation*, or *relaxation*, or *love*, or *sacrifice*.

Lastly, before passing on to the modern advocacy of the Atonement, it is *desirable to show how the Calvinistic doctrine of the Atonement underwent yet another development*. In studying this new development, it is necessary to pass from Europe to America. In Europe, as we have seen, strict Calvinism became modified strict Calvinism; we are now to see *Modified Strict Calvinism pass into what is called Moderate Calvinism* under the influence of the so-called New England Theology.

Certainly the original theology of New England was strict Calvinism, or Hyper-Calvinism. But early in the eighteenth century, "strong and independent minds began to appear in the ranks of the New England ministry, whose philosophical acumen and practical earnestness could not rest satisfied with a theological system which to them seemed palpably inconsistent in parts, and morally paralyzing as a whole. These, prompted partly by their own subjective difficulties, and

partly by the exigencies and influence of the period which witnessed the rise of New England Unitarianism, the introduction of Universalism, the visits of Charles Wesley and George Whitfield, the planting of Methodism, the Revolutionary War, the abolition of slavery in the New England States, the defection from orthodoxy of Harvard College and the largest churches of Massachusetts, the end of the compulsory support of religion by taxes, the fall of the Lockian and the rise of a transcendental school of philosophy, the extension of the Baptist and of the Methodist Episcopal and Protestant Episcopal churches over all the New England States, the founding of the noble missions of the American Board,—not to mention remoter and less important events,—commenced a series of modifications in the traditional Calvinistic system of doctrine designed to render it more rational, more palatable to the believer, and more easily defensible against the assailant. The process has been going forward with a good degree of steadiness ever since the days of President Edwards. One has suggested change in one part, another in another; one has brought forward a metaphysical novelty, another a theological one, a third an ethical; liberal and progressive influences have become incorporated in organs and institutions; free pulpits have popularized the various innovations: new generations have grown up under the influence of the improved doctrination; in short, an almost complete theological revolution has gradually taken place."[1] Even Jonathan Edwards advanced principles and made statements which logically necessitated this revolution, and from his day to the present this new school of thought has steadily gained ground, numbering in its ranks such names as the younger Edwards, Hopkins, Dwight, and Emmons, perhaps the greatest names among American divines after Jonathan Edwards. Through the influence of such men, Moderate Calvinism, as it came to be called, became avowed in Great Britain by men like Andrew Fuller, Principal Hill, Robert Hall, Carey, Jay, George Payne, Ralph Wardlaw, Pye-Smith, Gilbert, and Lindsay Alexander. "At the present time the peculiarities

[1] President Warren, in M'Clintock and Strong's *Theological Encyclopædia*, vol. x. p. 327.

of New School New England theology (Moderate Calvinism) have very general prevalence in the orthodox Congregational churches of the New England and Western States, and are favoured by many in other Calvinistic bodies. They are taught in the theological seminaries of Andover, New Haven, Bangor, and Chicago. They are disseminated by quarterly and other organs of marked ability, among which the *Bibliotheca Sacra* and *New Englander* hold the first rank. They have affected the current theological teachings of the Baptist churches not a little; and the great schism which divided the Presbyterian churches in 1837 was chiefly traceable to their influence in that communion." *Amongst other views amended by this school of thought were, largely under the influence of Grotius, the earlier Calvinistic views upon the Atonement.* For two great principles underlie the entire teaching of this school, viz. that all sin and holiness are of a voluntary nature (the constitution of man is not sin, but is the invariable occasion of sin), and that moral character and deserts are in no way transferable. Such principles could not but affect the view taken of the atonement of Jesus.

The doctrine of Atonement held by this school of Moderate Calvinists is as follows. On the necessity for an atonement, they teach that it was governmental, not punitive, and certainly not arbitrary. As to its extent, they teach that it was designed for all men as truly as for any. As to its mode, they teach that Christ did not suffer the exact penalty of the law, but pains substituted for that penalty and answering the purpose of penalty in moral government. Further, if all this seem to be Arminianism rather than Calvinism, let it be remembered that Moderate Calvinism holds firmly that individual salvation is dependent upon individual election.

In the Introductory Essay to his work on "Atonement,"[1] entitled "The Rise of the Edwardean Theory of the Atonement," Dr. Park, himself one of the oldest modern representatives of the school, formulates this theory of the Atonement as follows, and in this mode of formulation he says

[1] *The Atonement; Discourses and Treatises, by Edwards, Smalley, Maxey, Emmons, Griffin, Burge, and Weeks, with an Introductory Essay by Edward A. Park, Boston.*

all its advocates, however much they differ in minor points, would agree.

First, says Dr. Park, the theory states: "Our Lord suffered pains which were substituted for the penalty of the law, and may be called punishment in the more general sense of that word, but were not, strictly and literally, the penalty which the law had threatened."

Second, continues Dr. Park, "This atonement was equal, in the meaning and spirit of it, to the payment of our debts, but it was not literally the payment, either of our debt of obedience or our debt of punishment, or any other debt which we owed to law or distributive justice" (distributive justice being that justice which gives to each his due).

Third, adds Dr. Park, "The law and distributive justice of God, although honoured by the life and death of Christ, will yet eternally demand the punishment of every one who has sinned."

Fourth, "The atonement rendered it consistent and desirable for God to save all who exercise evangelical faith, yet it did not render it obligatory on Him in distributive justice to save them."

Fifth, "The atonement was designed for the welfare of all men; to make the eternal salvation of all men possible; to remove all the obstacles which the honour of the law and of distributive justice presented against the salvation of the non-elect as well as the elect."

Sixth, "The atonement does not constitute the reason why some men are regenerated and others not, but this reason is found only in the sovereign, electing will of God."

Seventh, "The atonement is useful on man's account, and in order to furnish new motives to holiness; but it is necessary on God's account, and in order to enable Him, as a consistent Ruler, to pardon any, even the smallest sin, and therefore to bestow on sinners any, even the smallest favour."

In all this there is very much which helps the understanding of the biblical doctrine of Atonement. For, according to that doctrine, Christ bore the penalty of death decreed upon sin. But was that death the very same penalty in quantity as would otherwise have been borne by all the

redeemed? The New Testament does not require such a doctrine. Or was that death the very same penalty in quality as would otherwise have been borne by all the redeemed? Neither does the New Testament demand such a doctrine. The death Christ suffered was the very penalty decreed upon sin; but this death is at once rendered unique and uniquely influential by the person of the divine-human Sufferer, and makes it possible for God to forgive the sinner who repents and to restore the sinner who believes. In short, the New Testament statements harmonize, not with the view that the sufferings of Christ were *identical* with the pains due to the saved sinners, nor with the view that they were *equivalent* to the pains due to the sinners saved, but with the view that the sufferings of Christ were *equivalent in moral force* to the infliction of punishment upon the sinner,—that those sufferings were such as enabled God to be just and the justifier of those who believe.

A further development was certain to follow upon this Moderate Calvinist theory of atonement. Some, that is to say, *would be sure to accept the Moderate Calvinist view as to the nature of the atonement, whilst they rejected the more peculiarly Calvinistic tenet associated therewith.* In other words, they would accept the developed and balanced governmental views of atonement as such, whilst rejecting the view as to election. Many instances are seen in the great Methodist bodies, where substitutionary views of the Moderate Calvinist type are apparently universal.[1]

It now only *remains,* in our historical survey, *to review the doctrines of the Atonement held at the present time.* To this we pass in the next chapter.

[1] See, especially, Randle's *Substitution, a Treatise on the Atonement;* and Miley, *The Atonement in Christ,* New York, 1881, one of the ablest books upon the Atonement published in recent years.

CHAPTER V.

CONTEMPORARY DOCTRINES OF THE ATONEMENT: THE THEORIES OF BUSHNELL, CAMPBELL, AND DALE.

"To judge rightly the time and its condition is the great thing; there is a time, as the Preacher says, to speak, and a time to keep silence."—MATTHEW ARNOLD, *Literature and Dogma*, Preface.

IN passing, however, to the survey of the doctrines held in recent years, there will be a great advantage in drawing up some classification of the several forms of doctrine which have been advocated. Nay, a classification of modern theories is best presented in connection with a classification of all theories.

Now, careful inspection shows that all doctrines of the Atonement may be arranged under three divisions, according to the person supposed to be affected by the death of Jesus for sin. Thus there are theories which consider the death of Jesus as influencing man (the so-called subjective, or moral, or moral-influence theories); and there are theories which consider the death of Jesus as influencing Satan; and there are theories which consider the death of Jesus as influencing God as well as man (the so-called objective or substitutionary theories).[1] The first class regard the forgiveness and cure

[1] It is true that an attempt has been made by Principal Simon to show that the moral-influence theories are also theories of substitution. Thus Dr. Simon says: "There is substantial agreement among all who have discussed the Atonement, that Christ's intervention in our behalf effects reconciliation or salvation—whatever that may include; as to which, opinions differ." And he goes on to say: "If this were remembered, disputes about the words representative, substitute, vicarious, mediator, might surely cease. He is our substitute, representative, mediator, whether we take an objective or a subjective view of the end to be accomplished, . . . whether His sufferings were a mere accident, so to speak, of His real work, like the sufferings of martyrs; or subordinate to His resurrection; or necessary to the completeness of the example

of sin as possible to God, *inasmuch as man is made better by the death of Christ*; the second class regard the forgiveness and cure of sin as possible to God, *inasmuch as Satan is silenced by the death of Christ;* and the third class consider the forgiveness and cure of sin as possible to God, *inasmuch as by the death of Christ difficulty within the Divine Nature is removed.* Briefly expressed, then, the several doctrines of the Atonement may be classed according as they represent the import of the death of Jesus as manward, or as Satanward, or as Godward (more accurately, as both Godward and manward). Further, each of these three main divisions shows several varieties.

The scheme of classification[1] *may then run as follows:—*

A. THE MANWARD THEORIES OF ATONEMENT ARE—*those which regard the death of Christ—*

1. *As influencing man by its example.* This is the *Socinian* theory, as we have seen; and it is also of necessity the *Unitarian* theory, as it appears in Martineau,[2] Freeman Clarke,[3]

He left us; or a part of the manifestation of the divine purity, truth, rectitude, holiness, love; or appointed, either on grounds of fitness and congruity, or of legal or moral necessity,—all this does not materially concern us. Did He actually speak, work, hunger, thirst? was He buffeted, despised, humbled? did He die *on our behalf?* Then was He in a most true sense our representative, substitute, mediator, the more so as by universal agreement He was and did what He was and did of His own loving choice, and absolutely without ill-desert of His own."—*Redemption of Man*, pp. 7, 8. But is this not eminently confusing and capricious? A substitute is always understood to be one who acts *in our stead*, not *in our behalf*. John Williams, the martyr of Erromanga, was "buffeted, despised, humbled," "actually spake, worked, hungered, thirsted," "was and did what he was and did of his own loving choice," but would it not be as capricious as confusing to call John Williams the substitute of his murderers?

[1] It will be seen that this classification differs largely from the classification given by Dr. Simon in his *Redemption of Man;* able as that classification is, it is, as the present writer ventures to think, rather clever than convincing. Here let it be added that Dr. Simon does not himself present any theory of the Atonement, biblical or otherwise, but only contributions to such a theory—some of which, as the discussion on "The anger of God," are invaluable. So, too, the two following books do not present positive contributions to our subject, viz. Lias, *The Atonement viewed in the Light of certain Modern Difficulties*, Hulsean Lectures for 1883–4, 2nd edition; and Burney, *Atonement, Review of Atonement and Law* (Armour), Nashville, Tennessee, 1887.

[2] Compare, *e.g.*, his sermon on "What the Christ ought to Suffer," in *Hours of Thought*, vol. ii. pp. 119–131.

[3] Compare his *Orthodoxy, its Truth and Error*, Boston, 1889: "Jesus Christ came, providentially, as the typical and perfect man—the one who was sent by

and Orville Dewey.[1] This is also the theory, it would appear, of Frederick Robertson,[2] and of Albrecht Ritschl.[3]

2. *As affecting man by its manifestation of love.* This, as we have seen, is the theory of Abelard. The same theory has been presented in recent years by Dr. John Young in his *Life and Light of Men,* and is often heard from latitudinarian pulpits.

3. *As affecting man by its display of sympathy,* the earlier theory of Bushnell, an analysis of which will follow presently.

4. *As affecting man by its combined sympathy and self-sacrifice,* the later theory of Bushnell, to be considered presently.

5. *As affecting man by imparting new life.* This would appear to be the theory of Schleiermacher.[4] This theory is often called the mystical theory, and was held by Edward

God, in His providence, to illustrate what humanity is to be and to do. . . The death of Jesus, therefore, manifested in a higher degree the same law which is illustrated in the death of all good and great souls, martyrs to a principle or to an idea. In proportion to the greatness and holiness of the martyr is the impression profound." Dr. Clarke then proceeds to give some instances from history which show that "the death of Jesus was not something wholly outside of law, wholly exceptional, but the highest example of the great effect produced by one who walks straight into death for a great idea;" and the instances he gives are those of Socrates, Joan of Arc, Savonarola, and Abraham Lincoln.

[1] *Works,* New and Complete Edition, Boston, 1883: "Why is the death of Jesus the highest subject in Christianity? Why is the cross the chiefest emblem of Christianity? . . . The chief answer to these questions is the *character* of Christ as the Saviour of men."

[2] "Christ simply came into collision with the world's evil, and bore the penalty of that daring." It should be added, however, that in Frederick Robertson we find rather the homiletic than the doctrinal mind.

[3] "The sufferings of Christ served no other purpose than that of *testing His faithfulness* in His vocation or mission. . . . Christ Himself accepted His sufferings as an accidental accompaniment of His positive faithfulness in the calling that had been appointed Him."—*Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung,* 2nd edit., vol. iii. pp. 416, 444, 525.

[4] "Christ held an archetypal relation to God; through Him and His life, God or He founded a Church which embodies the principle of His life; Christ bore sympathetically human sufferings and sin, and yet His relation to God was not disturbed by them; those who become members of His Church enter into His life, and therefore become in principle what He was, and are no longer separated from God by sin and suffering: they are thus redeemed, on the one hand, by His action through the living organization which He established, and which His life in all its aspects animates and inspires; on the other hand, by what they read of His example and teaching." So Principal Simon summarizes the views of Schleiermacher, in his *Redemption of Man,* p. 62.

Irving, as it is also held by many Anglican and Roman Catholic writers,[1] for whom the Crucifixion is but a phase in the Incarnation, and the Incarnation is a descent of the divine to the human, that the human may be lifted to the divine. Further, this theory of vitalization would also seem to be at the basis of much popular preaching to-day, which insists on the new life as curative of sin as depravity, whilst ignoring any genuine atonement for sin as transgression. Any Scripture theory of atonement, as we have seen, accentuates this effect of Christ's death upon man at the same time that it emphasizes the effect of this death upon God.

B. THE SATANWARD THEORIES OF ATONEMENT ARE *the several forms of the Patristic theory,* already considered. Thoughtful advocates of this view are not to be found to-day, although the theory crops up occasionally in evangelistic preaching of the more rhetorical type.

C. THE GODWARD THEORIES OF ATONEMENT ARE *those which regard the death of Jesus*—

1. *As substitutionary, because the death of a surety.* This is the Anselmic theory. Amongst its modern exponents are Dr. Armour, in his *Atonement and Law,*[2] and Dr. Lewis Edwards, in his *Doctrine of Atonement.*[3] This theory also lies behind much popular preaching of the type which declares that Christ paid the full debt the sinner owes to God.

2. *As substitutionary, because the death of more than a surety.* This is the theory of "superabundant satisfaction," as found in Aquinas and many Romanists, this theory, indeed, lying at the base of the Romish doctrine of grace.

3. *As substitutionary, because the death of a sponsor.* According to this theory, Jesus is our sponsor, who answers for our holiness to God, and in our name dies unto sin.[4]

4. *As substitutionary, because the bearing of the identical penalty due to the elect, including the pains of hell,*—the Hyper-

[1] Compare Wilberforce, *Doctrine of the Incarnation,* 1879; Oxenham, *History of the Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement.*

[2] *Atonement and Law, or Redemption in Harmony with Law as revealed in Nature,* 1886.

[3] *The Doctrine of the Atonement.* Translated by Rev. David Charles Edwards, M.A. 1886.

[4] Canon Norris, *Rudiments of Theology,* pp. 40–67.

Calvinist theory of the seventeenth century; a form of doctrine which has no advocates to-day among theologians, although it survives in some popular preaching.

5. *As substitutionary, because the bearing of a penalty equivalent to that due to the elect*, the modified Hyper-Calvinist theory, a theory held, as has been pointed out, by many Presbyterians in Scotland and America. Its latest and most elaborate exponent is Cochrane, *The Moral System and the Atonement.*

6. *As substitutionary, because the bearing of the penalty demanded by the Righteous Governor of the Universe, that the free forgiveness and cure of sin do not endanger moral government.* As has been seen, this theory—the rectoral, governmental,[1] Edwardean, Moderate Calvinist, or modern Arminian theory—has had a large following in Germany,[2] and England, and America. This is also substantially the theory of Dr. Dale (to be considered presently).

7. *As substitutionary of the penitence due from all sinners;* the theory of M'Leod Campbell—of which more presently—and of Newman Smyth.[3]

8. *As substitutionary of the sacrifice due from all sinners;* a theory which has assumed various forms, such as those of Limborch and Curcellæus, already considered, according to which the sacrifice of Christ was an offering of suffering accepted by God as an equivalent for penalty (a theory indistinguishable from the rectoral theory), and such as that of F. D. Maurice, according to which the sacrifice of Christ was an offering of obedience.[4]

[1] Dr. Simon, it is true, denies that the so-called governmental theories are in any sense Godward theories, seeing that these theories represent the aim of the atonement to be the production of a moral impression upon man. Of course, such an objection is valid as against much said by Grotius, and against some incautious utterances of later writers. But if governmental theories are defined as above, the objection does not hold. According to some forms of the rectoral theory, the suffering of Christ satisfies God as well as impresses man.

[2] The theory was advocated in the last century by the Supernaturalists, *e.g.* by Flatt and Storr and Stäudlin, and has been more recently advocated by such leaders as Gess, *Christi Person und Werk*, and Isaac Dorner in his *System of Christian Doctrine.*

[3] *The Reality of Faith.*

[4] F. D. Maurice, *The Doctrine of Sacrifice as deduced from the Scriptures,*

Of these several theories three only call for more special attention, seeing the historical survey of the last chapter, viz., the theories of Bushnell, Campbell, and Dale.

"Did the Almighty," says Lessing, "holding in His right hand *truth*, and in His left *search after truth*, deign to tender me the one I might prefer,—in all humility, but without hesitation, I should request *search after truth*."[1] A parallel, if not as startling a paradox, would be, "Great books do not of necessity owe their value to the amount of truth which they contain." Books without number, the conclusions of which have long been regarded as only deserving of decent burial, live because of the invaluable method by which those conclusions were professedly reached, or because of the imperishable style under which those conclusions were conveyed. The asides of some writers possess a more lasting and attractive influence than their deliberate and darling labours. In books, as in education, discipline is as coveted a gem as express teaching. Thinking that is erroneous is not therefore devoid of stimulus; views which time proves incorrect, are not therefore unadapted to a temporary state of the public mind; opinions easily shown to be inconsequent, are not therefore inconvenient; sentiments intrinsically false, are not therefore adventitiously inapt. The *search after truth* of some minds is more precious than the *truth* of others.

We have thus prefaced the further contents of this chapter, because it is always an invidious task to criticise the writings of those to whom we are under obligation for guidance or

New Edition, 1879. "The Father's will is a will to all good. The Son obeys, and fulfils in our flesh that will by entering into the lowest condition into which men had fallen through their sins. For this reason, He is an object of continual complacency to His Father, and that complacency is fully drawn out by the death of the cross. His death is a sacrifice—the only complete sacrifice ever offered. The cross is thus the meeting-point between man and man, between man and God. In it all the wisdom and truth and glory of God were manifested to the creature, and in it man is presented as a holy and acceptable sacrifice to God." So Dr. Simon presents the views of Maurice, in his *Redemption of Man*, p. 35. John Todd Ferrier, in his *Sacrifice a Necessity, or the Atonement in the Light of our Lord's Teaching, and the Unfolding of the Sacrificial Idea*, 1888, as far as I understand him, presents a similar view.

[1] Quoted by Sir William Hamilton, *Metaphysics*, Lect. i. vol. i. p. 13.

encouragement, for suggestiveness or spiritual force. And this is peculiarly the case with recent writers. By the lapse of time and the respect of ages, the great theologians of the past have gained their halo of fame, and are viewed through that mist of enchantment which distance lends ; Augustine will always be "the Saint of Hippo," and Aquinas "the angelical doctor;" to detract from them in one thing, can never be to detract in all, and their deeds and characters and opinions may be animadverted on without apology. With those, however, who are our contemporaries, or the awe of whose lamented decease has scarcely faded from our hearts, it is otherwise; the faults of friends or familiars in the home or in the study we would fain forget in their virtues, and inalienable instincts coincide in the sentiment, *de mortuis nil nisi bonum.*

Such thoughts must in all reverence preface the examination of the leading work[1] of that chaste, patient, and loving spirit, John M'Leod Campbell, which none can read without a tribute to the deep spirituality of its author, to his grave intelligence and manly sympathy with those who are perplexed by the religious unsettlement of modern times. The history of Dr. Campbell's view of the atonement is instructive. "It is about forty years," he writes in the notes to his third edition, "since the moral and spiritual nature of the atonement first dawned upon my mind. What was then prominent in my faith and in my teaching was the universality of the atonement and the assured peace with God, which is quickened by the faith of the forgiveness of sins revealed in the gospel. But my attention was drawn to the nature of the atonement in tracing out the moral and spiritual power of faith in it, and in considering its immediate and direct object of bringing us to God. This element in my teaching, however, was not included when that teaching was called in question. But, subsequently, it more and more occupied my thoughts, gradually, through many years, taking the form which it presents in this book, viz. a moral and spiritual atonement, and which was such in itself,—not simply accepted as such because of

[1] *The Nature of the Atonement, and its Relation to Remission of Sins and Eternal Life.*

the moral excellence manifested in Christ in making it. . . . A continually deepening sense of the importance of the conclusions at which I had arrived on this great subject at last induced me to write on it. And, as a preparation for this task, I thought it right to acquaint myself as much as possible with the state of mind on the subject of the atonement, in which I might expect to find religious men. . . . My endeavour was to discern any element of truth present in what I read, and to separate it from the error with which it might be combined; and thus the words of President Edwards, 'either an equivalent punishment or an equivalent sorrow and repentance,' suggested to me that that earnest and deep thinker had really been on the verge of that conception of a moral and spiritual atonement which was occupying my own thoughts."[1] For this history of Dr. Campbell's initiation into the guild of great thinkers upon the atonement, we cannot be too thankful. That history gives us a satisfactory starting-point for his subsequent results: it was in reality a repugnance to the current Modified Hyper-Calvinist doctrine of his time upon one aspect of the atonement—a desire to find a basis, intellectual if not biblical, for "the universality of the atonement"—that prompted a further study of the subject. But this theory of Dr. Campbell's is by no means the only one consistent with the biblical statement that Christ died for all men.

Having premised that of the two fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith, the Incarnation and the Atonement, the incarnation is "the primary and highest fact," and the atonement the secondary and derivative in the history of God's relation to man, Dr. Campbell goes on to say that, "assuming the incarnation," he has "sought to realize the divine mind in Christ as perfect Sonship towards God, and perfect brotherhood towards man, and doing so the incarnation has appeared developing itself naturally and necessarily as the atonement."[2] Defining more accurately the plan he has marked out for himself, Dr. Campbell further says, that of

[1] *The Nature of the Atonement, and its Relation to Remission of Sins and Eternal Life*, 3rd ed. pp. 398–400.

[2] *Ibid.* Introd. p. xvii.

the three aspects of the atonement,—its reference, its object, and its nature,—it is its nature that he proposes to consider; and that with more immediate reference to the second aspect, what it has accomplished in regard to the remission of sins and the gift of eternal life.[1]

Thus viewed, Dr. Campbell considers the atonement to have a twofold reference,—the one *retrospective*, relating to the evil from which deliverance is effected; the other *prospective*, relating to the good bestowed.[2] Further, the *retrospective* and *prospective* aspects each presents two sides—viz. first, Christ's dealing with men on the part of God; and, secondly, His dealing with God on the part of men.[3] To the illustration of these several bearings of the atonement the greater part of the book is given.

Commencing with the retrospective aspect, Christ's dealing with men on the part of God is first considered. "It was in our Lord the natural outcoming of the life of love—of love to the Father, and of love to us—to show us the Father, to vindicate the Father's name, to witness for the excellence of that will of God against which we were rebelling, to witness for the trustworthiness of that Father's heart in which we were refusing to put confidence, to witness for the unchanging character of that love in which there was hope for us, though we had destroyed ourselves. This witness-bearing for God ('I have given Him for a witness to the people') was accomplished in the personal perfection that was in Christ, His manifested perfection in humanity,—that is to say, the perfection of His own following of the Father as a dear child, and the perfection of His brotherly love in His walk with men. His love and His trust towards His Father, His love and His long-suffering towards His brethren,—the latter being presented to our faith in its oneness with the former,—were together what He contemplated when He said, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.'"[4] And this witness-bearing for the Father (which, by the by, no evangelical teacher leaves out of his teaching upon the influence of Christ, however strongly he refuses to

[1] *The Nature of the Atonement, and its Relation to Remission of Sins and Eternal Life*, pp. 1, 2.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 6. [3] *Ibid.* pp. 127, 128. [4] *Ibid.* p. 129.

see in that witness-bearing an atonement for sin) Dr. Campbell asserts to be an element in the sacrifice Christ made for sin: "This witness-bearing for the Father was a part of the self-sacrifice of Christ. The severity of the pressure of our sins upon the spirit of Christ was necessarily greatly increased through that living contact with the enmity of the carnal mind to God into which Christ was brought, in being to men a living epistle of the grace of God. His honouring the Father caused men to dishonour Him; His manifestation of brotherly love was repaid with hatred; His perfect walk in the sight of men failed to commend either His Father or Himself; His professed trust in the Father was cast up to Him, not being believed, and the bitter complaint was wrung from Him, 'Reproach hath broken my heart.'"[1]

The dealing of Christ with God on behalf of men in its prospective aspect is next considered; this second feature of the mediatorial work of Christ is "a perfect confession of human sin." If the Lord Jesus mediates between God and man by a representation in Himself of the nature of God, He mediates between man and God by a representation in Himself of the nature of man: "That oneness of mind with the Father, which towards man took the form of condemnation of sin, would, in the Son's dealing with the Father in relation to our sins, take the form of a perfect confession of our sins. This confession, as to its own nature, must have been *a perfect Amen in humanity to the judgment of God on the sin of man.* Such an Amen ('a deep, multiform, all-embracing, harmonious' Amen, as Dr. Campbell elsewhere states[2]) was due in the truth of things. He who was the truth could not be in humanity and not utter it; and it was necessarily a first step in dealing with the Father in our behalf. He who would intercede for us must begin by confessing our sins. This all will at once perceive. But let us weigh this confession of our sins by the Son of God in humanity. . . . Apart from the question of the suffering present in that confession of our sins, and the depth of meaning which it gives to the expression, 'a

[1] *The Nature of the Atonement, and its Relation to Remission of Sins and Eternal Life*, p. 130.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 225.

sacrifice for sin,' let us consider this Amen from the depths of the humanity of Christ to the divine condemnation of sin. What is it in relation to God's wrath against sin? What place has it in Christ's dealing with that wrath? I answer: He who so responds to the divine wrath against sin, saying, 'Thou art righteous, O Lord, who judgest so,' is necessarily receiving the full apprehension and realization of that wrath, as well as of that sin against which it comes forth into His soul and spirit, into the bosom of the divine humanity; and, so receiving it, He responds to it with a perfect response,—a response from the depths of that divine humanity,—and *in that perfect response he absorbs it.* For that response has all the elements of a perfect repentance in humanity for all the sin of man,—a perfect sorrow, a perfect contrition,—all the elements of such a repentance, and that in absolute perfection,—all, excepting the personal consciousness of sin; and by that perfect response in Amen to the mind of God in relation to sin is the wrath of God rightly met, and that is accorded to divine justice which is its due and could alone satisfy it." [1]

So much for the nature of this expiation by confession; but some attention, Campbell affirms, must also be paid, to render the theory complete, to the *intensity* of the sufferings of Christ which this confession—this utterance of "the perfect Amen in humanity to the judgment of God on the sin of man"—entailed. That intensity "was according to the perfection of the divine mind in the sufferer, and the capacity of suffering which is in suffering flesh." [2]

To illustrate this novel view of the nature of the atonement of Christ, Dr. Campbell appends the following illustration:—"Let us suppose that all the sin of humanity has been committed by one human spirit, on whom is accumulated this immeasurable amount of guilt, and let us suppose this spirit, loaded with all this guilt, to pass out of sin into holiness, and to become filled with the light of God becoming perfectly righteous with God's own righteousness,—such a change, were such a change possible, would imply in the spirit so changed

[1] *The Nature of the Atonement, and its Relation to Remission of Sins and Eternal Life*, pp. 135–137.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 139.

a perfect condemnation of the past of its own existence, and an absolute and perfect repentance, a confession of its sin commensurate with its evil. If the sense of personal identity remained, it must be so. Now, let us contemplate this repentance with reference to the guilt of such a spirit, and the question of pardon for its past sin, and admission now to the light of God's favour. Shall this repentance be accepted as an atonement, and, the past sin being thus confessed, shall the divine favour flow out on that present perfect righteousness which thus condemns the past? or shall that repentance be declared inadequate? shall the present perfect righteousness be rejected on account of past sin, so absolutely and perfectly repented of? and shall divine justice still demand adequate punishment for the past sin, and refuse to the present righteousness adequate acknowledgment—the favour which, in respect of its own nature, belongs to it? It appears to me impossible to give any but one answer to these questions. We feel that such a repentance as we are supposing would, in such a case, be the true and proper satisfaction to offended justice, and that there would be more atoning worth in one tear of the true and perfect sorrow which the memory of the past would awaken in this now holy spirit, than in endless ages of penal woe. Now, with the difference of personal identity, the case I have supposed is the actual case of Christ."[1] Yes, "*with the difference of personal identity;*" but is it not just "this difference of personal identity," a reasoner might say, which has led Dr. Campbell to reject the idea of a vicarious bearing of punishment, and is a vicarious confession any more intelligible?

Passing, then, to the prospective aspect of the atonement, Campbell urges—we speak of the matter briefly, because it is not of high importance to a comprehension of his peculiar theory—that, manwards, it was a bringing of humanity into the life of sonship,[2] and, Godwards, an intercession on man's behalf.[3] Upon the very suggestive chapters on "Intercession regarded as Prayer," and on "The Life and Sufferings of Christ as illustrative of the Continuity of Sonship," we do not enter.

[1] *The Nature of the Atonement, and its Relation to Remission of Sins and Eternal Life*, pp. 145, 146.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 162.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 174.

A general summary of this theory of M'Leod Campbell's may be given in his own words: "In the life of Christ, as the revelation of the Father by the Son, we see the love of God to man, the will of God for man, the eternal life which the Father has given to us in the Son, that salvation which the gospel reveals as the apostle knew it when he invited men to the fellowship of it as fellowship with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ. Proceeding from this contemplation of the light of eternal life as shining in Christ's own life on earth, to consider the Son in His dealing with the Father on our behalf, and contemplating Him now as bearing us and our sins and miseries on His heart before the Father, and uttering all that in love to the Father and to us He feels regarding us —all His divine sorrow—all His desire—all His hope—all that He admits and confesses as against us—all that, notwithstanding, He asks for us, with that in His own human consciousness, in His following the Father as a dear child walking in love, which justifies His hope in making intercession, enabling Him to intercede in conscious righteousness as well as conscious compassion and love, we have the elements of the atonement before us as presented by the Son and accepted by the Father, and see the grounds of the divine procedure in granting to us remission of our sins and the gift of eternal life."[1]

The question of the validity of this theory turns upon the validity of its hypothesis of the remission of sins upon the vicarious confession of sins by Jesus Christ. Justly enough, Dr. Campbell speaks of *prospective* and *retrospective* aspects of the atonement, and of each of these in their manward and Godward relation; nevertheless, to treat of each of these at length in an examination professedly upon the *nature* of the atonement, is to introduce some confusion into the main question. All who accept in any form the New Testament statements are agreed that Christ revealed the Father, all are agreed that the atonement of Christ brought man into the life of sonship, all are agreed that the heavenly life of Christ is intercessory; but, with commendable wisdom, theologians have

[1] *The Nature of the Atonement, and its Relation to Remission of Sins and Eternal Life*, p. 176.

been in the habit of keeping the doctrine of the Person of Christ, the doctrine of the Offices of Christ, and the doctrine of the Adoption of Believers, distinct from the doctrine as to the *Nature* of the Atonement. The question at issue is, not what was the retrospective aspect of the atonement in its manward relation, not what was the prospective aspect of the atonement either Godwards or manwards, but what was that work of Christ which rendered these aspects possible,—what was that work of Christ which rendered it possible for Him to reveal the Father's attribute of loving forgiveness, which rendered it possible for Him to enter upon a life of intercession, which rendered it possible for man to share the privileges of adoption? The one contested point is, to adopt Campbell's terminology, the retrospective aspect of the atonement Godwards; in other words, the work of Christ which facilitated the remission of sins. That work of Christ, it must be confessed with a considerable lack of directness, Dr. Campbell asserts to be the vicarious confession of sins. Is this hypothesis valid? When Jesus is described as the Lamb of God who bore our sins, is all that is meant this, that Jesus appreciated the extent and enormity of our sins and repented of them in our stead? Dr. Campbell's reply is in the affirmative: "It was not in us so to confess our sins" (that is to say, in such a way as to draw forth the divine forgiveness), "neither was there in us such knowledge of the heart of the Father. But if another could in this act for us, if there might be a mediator, an intercessor, one at once sufficiently one with us, and yet sufficiently separated from our sin to feel in sinless humanity what our sinful humanity, could it in sinlessness look back on its sins, would feel of godly condemnation of them and sorrow for them, so confessing them before God,—one coming sufficiently near to our need of mercy to be able to plead for mercy for us according to that need, and, at the same time, so abiding in the *bosom of the Father*, and in the light of His love and secret of His heart, as in interceding for us to take full and perfect advantage of all that is *there* that is on our side, and wills our salvation;—if the Son of God has, in the power of love, come into the capacity of such mediation in taking our nature and becoming our brother, and in that same power of love, has

been contented to suffer all that such mediation, accomplished in suffering flesh, implied,—is not the suitableness and the acceptableness of the sacrifice of Christ, when His soul was made an offering for sin, what we can understand?"[1] Unfortunately, intelligibility is not the prime criterion of truth in the matter, nor is luminosity, nor unity, nor simplicity, to each of which appeal is made.[2] The sole legitimate question is, "Is this atonement by vicarious confession scriptural?" And the reply must be, that, whilst a vicarious bearing of the punishment of death decreed upon human sin is abundantly scriptural, not a single scriptural precedent can be advanced for a vicarious confession of sins. Much might be alleged against this theory, on the score that such a vicarious confession is a contradiction in terms, as Socinians have so constantly asserted that the idea of vicarious punishment is a contradiction in terms—confession to be valid must be personal; but with philosophical and ethical discussion we have nothing to do: the theory is condemned because it is contrary to the express statements of Scripture.

A crucial point for such a theory is the explanation it affords of the death of Christ. The *consensus* of the New Testament teaching attaches an inexpressible importance to the death of Christ in the achievement of reconciliation between God and man; what assistance is rendered by this theory in the interpretation of that prominent position of Christ's death? How do Gethsemane and Golgotha, and their paramount position in the apostolic discourses, harmonize with this theory? Dr. Campbell does not shrink from the test. The closing scenes of our Lord's life, in his esteem, gave on the one hand the finishing touch to the Son's witness for the Father; for to go to death still trusting in the Father was to perfectly manifest the love that there was in God, was to put his sense of Sonship to the severest test.—"He who in coming into the world had said, 'Lo, I come to do Thy will, O God,' who could, as to the fulfilment of this purpose, say to the Father, 'I have

[1] *The Nature of the Atonement, and its Relation to Remission of Sins and Eternal Life*, p. 149.

[2] *Ibid.* cap. xiv.

glorified Thee on the earth, I have declared Thy name, and will declare it,' is seen here at the close of His course, as one holding fast the beginning of His confidence, and in this last trying time, and while subjected to the hour and power of darkness, sustained by the simple faith of that original fatherliness of the Father's heart, which He *had come forth to reveal*, and TO REVEAL BY TRUSTING IT."[1] On the other hand, these closing sufferings gave its ultimate depth to the confession of our sins; sin as seen on the cross was a new thing from its malignancy, an experience not otherwise obtainable; and "it is obvious that all by which the pressure of our sins on the Spirit of Christ was increased, and He was brought into closer contact with them and deeper experience of the hatred of the darkness to the light, must have given a continually deepening character to Christ's dealing with the Father on our behalf;—giving an increasing depth to His response to the divine condemnation of our sin, causing that response to be rendered in deeper agony of spirit, and, at the same time, rendering His persevering intercession a casting Himself more and more on the further and deeper depths of fatherliness in the Father. . . . Neither without this could an adequate confession of man's sin have been offered to God in humanity in expiation of man's sin, nor intercession have been made according to the extent of man's need of forgiveness."[2] In other words, Dr. Campbell's view is, that death was superadded to the incarnation to afford opportunity of experiencing the heights of trust and the depths of sin. But appeal may be confidently made to any student of the Scriptures whether such conceptions are ever wholly or in part attached to the death of Christ in the New Testament? Have not our preceding examinations conclusively demonstrated that in the New Testament teaching the incarnation was but a stage towards the crucifixion, that the crucifixion is not an accident or necessary consequence of the incarnation, and, further, that the death of Christ occupied its paramount position in the apostolic preaching and exhortation because it was that death

[1] *The Nature of the Atonement, and its Relation to Remission of Sins and Eternal Life*, p. 285.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 289.

which proclaimed to the world the vicarious endurance by Jesus, the Son of God and the son of Mary, of the penalty of death decreed upon human sin?

With all its wealth of illustration and fervour of spiritual affection, the *Nature of the Atonement and its Relation to the Remission of Sins and Eternal Life* stands convicted of inadequately interpreting the biblical statements upon the subject of which it treats. Its fundamental assumption, that the crucifixion was comparatively unimportant when compared with the incarnation, has vitiated its entire conclusions. It is the death of Christ which the Scriptures lay stress upon. Undoubtedly it was a consequence of the incarnation that a revelation was made of the nature of God as apprehended in human consciousness, but this revelation is no more connected with the death of Christ than with His life; and as for the complete confession of human sin which death, and such a death, alone rendered possible, such a confession, if valid, is nowhere alluded to in Scripture, nor implied therein. The scriptural conceptions of the validity and potency of the death of Jesus is, as we have seen, the death of the Lawgiver, who has not Himself transgressed His law, on behalf of those who have so transgressed.

How near, in his recoil from theories associated by him with the belief in a limited atonement, Dr. Campbell came to the New Testament conception of the death of Christ, may be seen in one extraordinary passage in his suggestive work: "When I think," he says, in his chapter on "The Death of Christ contemplated as the Tasting Death," "of our Lord as tasting death, *it seems to me as if He alone ever truly tasted death.* . . . What men shrink from when they shrink from death, is either the disruption of the ties that connect them with a present world, or the terrors with which an accusing conscience fills the world to come. The last had no existence for Him who was without sin; neither had the world, as the present evil world, any place in His heart. And even as to that purer interest in the present scene, which the relationships of life, cherished aright and according to God's intention in them, awaken, and the trial that death may be from this cause, there was in our Lord's

case nothing parallel to it, unless that care of His mother which He devolved upon the beloved disciple. But *death*, AS DEATH, is distinct from such accompanying considerations as these, and *our Lord tasted it in the truth of that which it is. For as He had truly lived in humanity, so did He also truly die;* death was to His humanity the withdrawal of the gift of that life which it closes. As men in life know not life as God's gift, neither realize what it is to live, so neither do they in death know God's withdrawal of that gift, nor consciously realize what it is to die. . . . *Further, as our Lord alone truly tasted death,* SO TO HIM ALONE HAD DEATH ITS PERFECT MEANING AS THE WAGES OF SIN, for in Him alone was there full entrance into the mind of God towards sin, and perfect unity with that mind. We have seen before that the perfect confession of our sins was only possible to perfect holiness; and so we may see also, that the tasting of death, in full realization of what it is that God Who gave life should recall it, holding it forfeited, was only possible to perfect holiness. . . . Had sin existed in men as mere spirits, death could not have been the wages of sin, and any response to the divine mind concerning sin which would have been an atonement for their sin could only have had spiritual elements; but, *man being by the constitution of humanity capable of death, and death having come as the wages of sin, it was not only sin that had to be dealt with, but an existing law with its* PENALTY *of death, and that death as already incurred. So it was not only the divine mind that had to be dealt with, but also that expression of the divine mind which was contained in God's making death the wages of sin.*"[1] Such a grasp as this passage displays upon the leading elements of the New Testament conception ought to have landed their spiritually-minded author in the New Testament doctrine.

Another modern theory deserving of attention is that of that acute thinker and subtle theologian, the late Horace Bushnell. His theory is contained in two works: *The Vicarious Sacrifice grounded on Principles of Universal Obliga-*

[1] *The Nature of the Atonement, and its Relation to the Remission of Sins and Eternal Life*, pp. 301-303. The italics are ours.

tion,[1] and *Forgiveness and Law grounded on Principles interpreted by Human Analogies*.[2]

Starting with the singular opinion, that "there is no example of mortal conceit more astonishing . . . than the assumption that the import of Christ's mission can be fairly and sufficiently stated in a dogma of three lines," Dr. Bushnell says, in his introduction to *The Vicarious Sacrifice*, that "he does not propose to establish any article whatever . . . but only to exhibit if possible the Christ whom so many centuries of discipleship have so visibly been longing and groping after, viz. the loving, helping, transforming, sanctifying Christ, the true soul-bread from heaven, the quickening life, the POWER OF GOD UNTO SALVATION." Then he proceeds straightway "to establish an article." The work of Christ he conceives "as beginning at the point of sacrifice, vicarious sacrifice, ending at the same, and being just this all through—so a power of salvation for the world." What he understands as *Vicarious Sacrifice* he states as follows:—The word "vicarious" is "a word that carries always a face of substitution, indicating that one person comes in place somehow of another; and when we speak of 'sacrifice,' any person acts in a way of vicarious sacrifice, not when he burns upon an altar in some other's place, but when he makes loss for him, even as he would make loss for himself, in the offering of a sacrifice for his sin."[3] The expression *Vicarious Sacrifice* "is a figure, representing that the party making such a sacrifice for another comes into burden, pain, weariness, or even to the yielding up of life, for his sake." The same conception Dr. Bushnell otherwise states as follows: "That Christ, in what is called His vicarious sacrifice, simply engages, at the expense of great suffering, and even of death itself, to bring us out of our sins themselves, and so out of their penalties, being Himself profoundly identified with us in our fallen state and burdened with our evils."[4]

A substantiation of this idea of salvation by sympathy is found by Dr. Bushnell in the words of Matthew, "Himself

[1] The quotations are from the English edition, published by Strahan, 1871.

[2] The quotations are from the English edition, published by Hodder & Stoughton, 1874.

[3] *Vicarious Sacrifice*, p. 5.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 7.

took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses." "A passage that is remarkable," he says, "as being the one Scripture citation that gives beyond a question the exact *usus loquendi* of all the vicarious and sacrificial language of the New Testament." In his view, this passage shows exactly what the substitution of Christ for sin was. "What, then, does it mean, that Christ 'bare our sicknesses'? Does it mean that He literally had our sicknesses transferred to Him, and so taken off from us? Does it mean that He became blind for the blind, lame for the lame, a leper for the lepers, suffering in Himself all the fevers and pains He took away from others? No one had ever such a thought. How, then, did He bear our sicknesses, or in what sense? In the sense that He took them on His feeling, had His heart burdened by the sense of them, bore the disgusts of their loathsome decays, felt their pain over again, in the tenderness of His more than human sensibility. Thus manifestly it was that He bare our sicknesses—His very love to us put Him so far in a vicarious relation to them, and made Him so far a partaker in them. Here, then, we have the true law of interpretation when the vicarious relation of Christ to our sins comes into view. It does not mean that He takes them literally upon Him, as some of the old theologians and a very few modern appear to believe; it does not mean that He took their ill-desert upon Him by some mysterious act of imputation, or had their punishment transferred to His person. A sickness might possibly be transferred, but a sin cannot by any rational possibility. It does not mean that He literally came into the hell of our retributive evils under sin, and satisfied, by His own suffering, the violated justice of God; for that kind of penal suffering would satisfy nothing but the very worst injustice. No, but the bearing of our sins does mean that Christ bore them on His feeling, became inserted into their bad lot by His sympathy as a friend, yielded up Himself and His life even to an effort of restoring mercy; in a word, that He bore our sins in just the same sense that He bore our sicknesses."[1]

This idea of vicarious sacrifice having thus been inferred from a single verse of Scripture, the whole of the subsequent

[1] *Vicarious Sacrifice*, pp. 9–11.

portion of the work is given to its illustration, enforcement, and defence. This subsequent portion is divided into four parts.

The first part of the *Vicarious Sacrifice* is supposed to substantiate the given theory of vicarious sacrifice, by showing its harmony with the universal principle of love. Instead of regarding it as a suspicious circumstance that such a definition of the vicarious sacrifice of Christ simply makes the atoning work of Christ, however different in manifestation or degree, an instance of any meritorious expression of sympathy with man in his lost estate, Dr. Bushnell regards this inevitable levelling as a peculiarly cogent proof of the correctness of his interpretation. To resolve the vicarious sacrifice of Christ into the principle of love, is to ground that sacrifice on principles of universal obligation; to build on the foundation of principles universally obligatory, is to impart to the superstructure the stability of the fundamental principles. There is nothing superlative in the vicarious sacrifice of Christ; nothing above the universal principles of right and duty—or, more correctly, if the exact tenor of the argument be retained, nothing foreign to the universal manifestation of love. If Christ displayed vicarious sacrifice, all good beings have done the same. This principle of vicarious sacrifice was displayed by the Eternal Father Who preceded Jesus, it was displayed by the Holy Spirit Who followed Him; nor was this struggling in the pains of vicarious sacrifice confined to the Blessed Trinity, for all good angels, all redeemed souls, have equally manifested that principle of love. Dr. Bushnell does not shrink from saying that the suffering of Christ "was vicarious suffering in no way peculiar to Him, save in degree."[1] He even concludes his discussion of the atoning virtue of human feeling for others by the astounding sentiment: "The supreme art of the devil never invented a greater mischief to be done, or a theft more nearly amounting to the stealing of the cross itself, than the filching away from the followers of Christ the conviction that they are thoroughly to partake the sacrifice of their Master."[2] Well might another Anselm inquire, *Cur Deus Homo?*

The second part endeavours to substantiate the theory

[1] *Vicarious Sacrifice*, p. 68. [2] *Ibid.* p. 82.

advocated, by showing its adequacy to explain the effects attributed in the New Testament to Christ's work. This is a necessary stage in the argument. The conception of vicarious sacrifice as the sympathetic sharing of others' woes having thus been discovered, and subsequently shown to be grounded on principles of universal obligation, acknowledged, that is to say, by all good minds, uncreated and created; it is imperative next to discuss how this vicarious sacrifice, examples of which are to be found in untold numbers amongst men and angels, as well as in the Father and the Spirit, came to be undertaken by Christ, and how in His case that vicarious sacrifice achieved results which no other instance of vicarious sacrifice ever achieved. Here it must be confessed that Dr. Bushnell himself seems to doubt the validity of his peculiar theory, and his reasoning hesitates. The vicarious sacrifice is seen, he maintains, throughout the life of Christ, and not pre-eminently in His death: "Christ did not come into the world to die; He died because He came into the world." The purpose for which this vicarious sacrifice of sympathy was undertaken by Christ was to effect "a regenerative, saving, truth-subjecting, all-restoring, inward change of the life" of man.[1] "We may sum up all that He taught, and did, and suffered, in the industry of His life and the pangs of His cross, and say that the one comprehensive, all-inclusive aim that draws Him on, is the change He will operate in the spiritual habit and future well-being of souls;"[2] or, as the same truth is otherwise expressed, the principal matter was to "inaugurate a grand restorative, new-creating movement on character—the reconciliation, that is, of man to God."[3] As to how this vicarious sacrifice achieved such a result as the reconciliation of man and God, the reply is that Christ's sympathy was, as Bushnell terms it, the moral power of God, that is to say, no mere influential example, no revelation simply of the love of the Father, but a manifestation of the entire moral perfection of God—the irresistible moral force of the divine character. It was to obtain and exert this moral influence that Christ lived and died, slowly accumulating it until it attained the requisite

[1] *Vicarious Sacrifice*, pp. 90–92.
[2] *Ibid.* pp. 109–110.
[3] *Ibid.* pp. 126–129.

body and volume; indeed, it was the object of the incarnation "to obtain through Jesus, and the facts and processes of His life, a new kind of power, viz. moral power, the same that is obtained by human conduct under human methods. It will be divine power still, only it will not be attribute power, that is, the power of His idea; this new power is to be the power cumulative, gained by Him among men as truly as they gain it with each other; only it will turn out in the end to be the grandest, closest to feeling, most impressive, most soul-renovating, and spiritually-sublime power that was obtained in this or any other world."[1] It is only due to Dr. Bushnell that, since he insists so strongly upon the salvation of man by the moral influence of the vicarious sacrifice, the process of the acquirement of this moral influence should be delineated after his manner. The moral power of Christ is a result indirectly arrived at. When the Holy Child was born, He was destitute of moral power; nor does it appear that previous to the entrance upon His public ministry he had done anything more than to beautifully and exactly fulfil His duties. He goes into His great work as a common man, a Nazarene carpenter, respected for nothing save as He compels respect by His works and His words. He continues his ministry for three years, travelling afoot, sleeping in desert places and on mountain-tops, associating mostly with the poor and humble; His doctrine was wonderful to all; but it does not appear that He grew at all by means of His discourses upon the public sentiment. A few persons like Martha and Mary, Nicodemus and Joseph, and His own disciples, were affected, probably few besides; for in the life of Jesus there are some things wonderfully sublime, some that are profoundly wise, some that repel, some that bear a grotesque look, some that are attractive and subduing as nothing else ever was, and some that even discourage confidence. And so He goes to the cross, and His moral influence has not appeared. His moral influence is not yet; between the infancy and the death a great many strange things and a great many lovely are seen; coruscations of glory have been shooting out all along the remarkable history; none the less Jesus dies, and the clue to

[1] *Vicarious Sacrifice*, p. 143.

His extraordinary life is not given. Then come the resurrection and ascension. Now His supernatural nature and mission come, for the first time, distinctly into thought; now He is known to have come from heaven and to have returned to heaven, having shown to mankind the righteousness and love of God. The clue is now obtained, and every incident in His life receives adequate explanation. Such, at any rate, is a brief abridgment of that very extraordinary chapter, so characteristic both of the strength and the weakness of Bushnell's intellect, upon "How Christ became so great a Power." It would thus appear to have been Dr. Bushnell's opinion that Christ was the power of God unto salvation, because of the moral influence which He had gained by the revelation of the love and compassion of God during the course of His exceptional life.[1] But there is, we repeat, considerable lack of clearness in his statement of his peculiar theory.

In the third part of *The Vicarious Sacrifice*, an attempt was made to show how this special theory harmonized with just views of the judicial and rectoral attributes of God; and, in the fourth, how this theory harmonized with a true interpretation of the sacrificial symbols of the Old Testament; but, since these two parts have been superseded by the author in his later work, their contents need not be further analyzed.

Thus far the work of Christ has been exhibited by Dr. Bushnell simply as a reconciling power on men, and on men only. His view of the vicarious sacrifice is that of a sympathetic suffering by which God manifest in the flesh so attracts fallen man as to reconcile him. In his later treatise, Dr. Bushnell confesses that this is not "sufficiently and scripturally true," and he proposes to supplement his former treatise, and present "a whole of doctrine that comprises both the reconciliation of men to God, and of God to men."[2] It is still assumed "that nothing can be true of God or of Christ, which is not true in some sense *more humano*, and is not made intelligible by human analogies;"[3] and it is intended, therefore, to complete the view of the work of Christ *by an*

[1] *Vicarious Sacrifice*, chap. iv. part ii. pp. 140–181.
[2] *Forgiveness and Law*, p. 33. [3] *Ibid.* p. 13.

analysis of human forgiveness, thereby illustrating how that great work of the Redeemer wrought upon God as well as upon man.

Finding, as he thinks, in the Lord's Prayer and elsewhere, scriptural evidence for assuming that "one kind of forgiveness matches and interprets another, and that the forgiveness of God may be explained by the forgiveness of man," Dr. Bushnell asks the question, "What is meant by a man's forgiveness of a man?" in other words, "What is the nature of forgiveness as exercised by the best and holiest men?" Genuine forgiveness, he replies, is not negative, a crying of quits simply. Such mere getting out, *I forgive*, is "only a plausible indifference under the guise of grace." True forgiveness must have its antecedent propitiation. "A good man lives in the unquestionable sway of universal love to his kind. If, then, one of them does him a bitter injury, will he therefore launch an absolute forgiveness on him? If he were nothing but love—if he were no complete moral nature—he might. But he is a complete moral nature, having other involuntary sentiments that come into play alongside of love, and partly for its sake—the sense of being hurt by wrong, indignation against wrongs done to others, disgusts to what is loathsome, contempt of lies, hatred of oppression, anger hot against cruel inhumanities,—all these animosities, or revulsions of feeling, fasten their grip on the malefactor sins and refuse to let go. And they do it as for society and the law-state of discipline; composing a court of arbitrament that we call moral opinion, which keeps all wrong-doing and wrong-doers under sanctions of public opprobrium and silent condemnations. Filling an office so important, they must not be extirpated under any pretext of forgiveness. They require to be somehow mastered, and somehow to remain. And the supreme art of forgiveness will consist in finding how to embrace the unworthy as if they were not unworthy, or how to have them still on hand when they will not suffer the forgiveness to pass. Which supreme art is the way of propitiation—always concerned in the reconciliation of moral natures separated by injuries."[1] True forgiveness is "no shove of dismission, no dumb turning of the

[1] *Forgiveness and Law*, p. 38.

back;" true forgiveness is forgiveness blended with propitiation.

And in order to this forgiveness blended with propitiation, two things are necessary: an intense sympathy with the transgressor, and a heavy sacrifice on his behalf. "In order to (right propitiation), two things are necessary: first, such a sympathy with the wrong-doing party as virtually takes his nature; and, secondly, a making cost in that nature by suffering, or expense, or painstaking sacrifice and labour. The sympathy must be of that positive kind which wants the man himself, and not a mere quiet relationship with him; wants him for a brother; considers nothing gained till it has gained a brother. The sympathy needs to be such as amounts to virtual identification, where there is a contriving how to feel the man all through, and read him as by inward appreciation, to search out his good and his evil, his weaknesses and gifts, his bad training and bad associations, his troubles and trials and wrongs—so to understand, and, as it were, be the man himself; having him interpreted to the soul's love, by setting all tenderest, most exploring affinities in play, finding how to work engagement in him, and learn what may be best touched or taken hold of in a way to make him a friend. Taking the wrong-doer thus upon itself, it will also take, in a certain sense, his wrong to be foreign; for its longing is after some most real identification with the fellow-nature sought after. Thus we see that to really forgive and make clean work of it, requires a going through into good, if possible, with the wrong-doer, and meeting him there, both reconciled. And when it is done thoroughly enough to configure and new-tone the forgiving party as well as the forgiven, he is so far become a reconciled or propitiated man, as truly as the other is become a forgiven or restored man."[1] But propitiation is not complete unless sacrifice be added to sympathy: "There remains a second indispensable condition, by which the advances of sympathy, finding their way into and through wrong-doers and enemies, will become a more nearly absolute power in them, and a more complete propitiation for them—viz. in the making cost and bearing heavy burdens of painstaking and

[1] *Forgiveness and Law*, pp. 40, 41.

sorrow to regain them and be reconciled to them. The injured party has a most powerful and multiform combination of alienated and offended sentiment struggling in his nature. And in one view it is right that he should have. He could not be a proper man, least of all a holy man, without them. His integrity is hurt, his holiness offended, his moral taste disgusted. He is alienated, thrown off, thrust back into separation, by the whole instinct of his moral nature. The fires of his purity smoke. His indignations scorch his love, and without any false fire of revenge, which is too commonly kindled also, he seems to himself to be in a revulsion that he has no will to subdue. He is a wounded man, whose damaged nature winces even in his prayers. So that if he says 'I forgive,' with his utmost strength of emphasis, he will not be satisfied with any meaning he can force into the words. Is he therefore to be blamed that he has so many of these dissentient feelings struggling in him to obstruct his forgivenesses? No, not in the sense that he has them, but only in the sense that he does not have them mitigated or propitiated so as to find themselves in consent or subjected to sacrifice. Let him find how to plough through the bosom of his adversary by his tenderly appreciative sympathy, how to appear as a brotherly nature at every gate of the mind, standing there as in cost, to look forgiveness without saying it, and he will find, however he may explain it or not explain it, that there is a wonderful consent in his feeling somehow, and that he is perfectly atoned—at-oned—both with himself and his adversary." [1] "Forgivenesses in men are ripened and fully brought to pass only as propitiations are;" "our human instincts put us always on making cost when we undertake to really forgive;" "human forgivenesses are possible to be consummated only by the help of some placation or atonement or cost-making sacrifice." [2]

To illustrate this method of propitiation by self-sacrifice, we cannot do better than quote, in Dr. Bushnell's own words, one of the concrete examples he adduces: "You had, we may suppose, a partner in trade, whom you had taken up out of his very dejected lot of poverty. Discovering talent and what

[1] *Forgiveness and Law*, pp. 41, 42. [2] *Ibid.* p. 48.

you thought was character in him, you took him into confidence to share your fortunes with you. Before you suspected danger from him, he had used the name and credit of your company, under cover of his legal rights, in a most faithless and cruel violation of trust, such as plucked you down out of wealth and reduced you to a lot of poverty so nearly complete that you had not even bread for your children. But your industry and worth brought you up again finally to affluence; while the vices into which he fell brought him down to want and hopeless destitution. Meantime, in all the intervening years, you have been remembering his wrong, which you could not well forget. His name has been, of course, a name significant of bitter wrong in your house, and so connected with pain as to be seldom or never spoken—a word, as it were, for the dumb. You have said inwardly, 'I must forgive,' and you have meant on principle to do it, perhaps really supposed it to be done; but there is, nevertheless, to this day a sting in that name, and you do not wish to hear it. To meet him on the street, or catch the look of his face, pains you, and you inwardly shudder as you pass him, at the discovery that, Christian as you are, you are certainly not reconciled to him, and see not how you ever can be. But you are shortly to find how you can be. The poor man, going down under his vices, loses name and figure, and is all but forgotten. But you hear that his family are suffering in bitter want. Did you not say that you could forgive, and what is come now but your opportunity? You send them in supplies and means of comfort, once and again,—concealing always your name, lest it may seem your revenge. By and by his son is arrested for crime, and who but you will volunteer to give the needed bail? and that requires your name. At length some infectious disease falls on the forlorn being and his family, and who will peril life in giving help and watch to people so completely out of consideration? But you said your forgiveness long ago, and what shall you do to make it good but go in to minister and be their saviour? The poor fellow turns himself to the wall when he sees you and weeps aloud, saying not a word, but just covering his face with his hands, and smothering his broken-hearted shame as best he can. Where now, on your

part, is the reluctance and revulsion that so often stifled your forgiveness? Gone, all gone, for ever! The word itself has become the sweetest of all words. By your painstaking endeavour and the peril you have borne for your enemy, you are so far reconciled in your own nature that you can now completely forgive, whether he can be rightly forgiven or not. He cannot be till he comes into a genuinely right mind, though still you none the less truly forgive. The forgiveness in you is potentially complete, even though it should never be actually sealed upon him. You have taken his sin upon you in the cost you have borne for his sake, and what you have borne thus freely for him quells that unreducible something, that dumb ague of justice that was disallowing your forgivenesses. It is even as if there had been a great sacrifice transacted in your soul's court of sacrifice, by which your condemnations that were blocking your sensibilities have been smoothed and soothed and taken away. Under so great patience and cost the forgiving charities are all out in your feeling, fresh and clear, and swinging the censers of their worship to pay the fragrant honours due." [1]

For this view of the work of Christ, Dr. Bushnell imagined he found support in Scripture,[2] first, in the English, Greek, and Hebrew sacrificial terminology; secondly, in the Old Testament sacrifices; and, thirdly, in a passage from the Epistle to the Romans. The first class of proofs consists in interpreting the Hebrew *kaphar* to mean *propitiate*, in the sense of *smoothing, mitigating, mollifying;* in interpreting the Greek ἱλάσκομαι in a similar manner, and in finding etymologically in the English equivalents (such as *atone*) for these words the same element of conciliation. Collateral evidence in support is also found, it is supposed, in the Old Testament sacrifices; for, first, those sacrifices make nothing of the pain of the victim; secondly, they display no vestige of a retributive quality in themselves; thirdly, they have no connection with compensation; fourthly, they were never offered as a legal substitution; and, fifthly, the legal emphasis laid upon blood was but "the collecting about the victim intensely sacred impressions." The argument that such an interpretation of the nature of forgive-

[1] *Forgiveness and Law*, pp. 42–45. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 63–73.

ness is scriptural, is concluded by quoting from Paul the words, "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in His blood," the import of which may be indicated, Dr. Bushnell thinks, by these three points: "First, there is a propitiation accomplished in Christ's life, and especially in His very tragic death, which prepares a way of forgiveness for the sins of the world; the forgiveness now will be more than verbal, it will be real, clean, complete. Secondly, it is God Himself Who is forward in this transaction—'Whom God hath set forth;' it is not Pilate who has done it, nor Caiaphas, nor the soldiers, but it is that God has suffered them so far to make irruption on His throne, and pluck down Him Who by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge was delivered into their hands; for how can it be imagined what the propitiation can do, save as it is set forth by the worst that sin can do, worsted itself in turn by the blood of its crime? And, thirdly, this propitiation is to be received only by faith—a 'propitiation through faith in His blood;' for it is this faith, in fact, which makes the murder a sacrifice, which it does by accepting it as the sacred altar-blood and life, and beholding in that sublime act of cost, in which God has bent Himself downwards, in loss and sorrow, over the hard face of sin, to say, and saying to make good, 'Thy sins are forgiven thee.'"[1]

Upon the remainder of the *Forgiveness and Law*, which treats of the harmony of this theory of propitiation with the idea of law, and of the significance under such a theory of justification by faith, it is foreign to our purpose to enter.

It is much to be regretted that Dr. Bushnell's expressed intention of recomposing in a more satisfactory form his entire views, instead of leaving them in their present scattered, confusing, and even contradictory state, will never be fulfilled. His entire theory upon the work of Christ would seem to divide itself into two parts, which may be termed after M'Leod Campbell, the dealing with man, and the dealing with God. The dealing with man is the bringing him to God by the moral influence of the special suffering endured; the dealing with God is the objectifying the divine forgiveness in such a way that, just as a good man only rightly forgives an injurer

[1] *Forgiveness and Law*, pp. 72, 73.

when he allays his own sense of injury by active beneficence, so the Almighty God may suffer and become appeased. Dr. Bushnell's point of view of the work of Christ in atonement is that of vicarious sacrifice, understanding by that term a self-sacrifice *in behalf of*, and not *instead of*, the human race, that self-sacrifice reconciling God to man by enabling God "to joyously 'endure the contradiction of sinners against himself' *propitiated by His endurances*," and that self-sacrifice reconciling man to God by affecting man as any other moral influence affects Him.

Had Dr. Bushnell stated to himself with any distinctness the contrast, so frequently alluded to, between nature and science, Scripture and theology, he would never have penned his sentiments about stating the import of Christ's mission "in a dogma of three lines." It is just these "dogmas of three lines" which it is the aim of all genuine theology to extract, and to obtain such dogmas now and again is sufficient reward for years of search. Such sentiments may be an excuse for non-conciseness of thought, but they are based upon a radical confusion of two very different things. Dr. Bushnell might have as justly objected to the study of the theory of music, because such a theory can never stir the soul as music itself does. Undoubtedly "a dogma of three lines" does not produce the same effect upon the many-sided nature of man as is produced by a sympathetic perusal of the Gospels; but science is one thing, preaching is another; science has one aim, direct address has another; to lack the characteristics of one is not to lack the characteristics of the other. Indeed, it would have been well if Dr. Bushnell, in his endeavour "to exhibit, if possible, the Christ Whom so many centuries of discipleship have so visibly been longing and groping after," had placed more clearly before himself the scientific purpose of any such search as his. In the absence of such determinate aim, the result has been that, regarded as a contribution to the study of the atonement, Dr. Bushnell's writings have repeated the mistake of M'Leod Campbell, and diluted the attention due to the main point at issue, by touching upon points collateral and undisputed.

The peculiar standpoint of Dr. Bushnell is to consider "the

work of Christ as beginning at the point of sacrifice—vicarious sacrifice, ending at the same, and being just this all through." Now, even had Dr. Bushnell adhered most rigidly to the scriptural conceptions of sacrifice, this method of view must have been misleading. The scriptural conception of sacrifice is either too wide or too narrow to convey any adequate view of the work of Christ in the remission of sins; too wide if *sacrifice* be used in its most general sense of *gift*, or *presentation*, or *offering*, too narrow if the word be restricted to *sin-offering*. In asking ourselves what was conveyed under the sacrificial language of the apostles, we felt it imperative, in the variety of answers apparently possible, to examine the testimony of the apostles themselves upon the matter, quite apart from all sacrificial allusions; and the consequence of our examination has been to demonstrate, that it is only by the licence of all figurative language that the work of Christ in dying can be called a sacrifice at all; its accurate sacrificial designation is *atonement*. But our author is doubly wrong, for he not only does not understand the scriptural view of sacrifice, he misunderstands it. With him, *vicarious sacrifice* is but another phrase for *sympathy*, with what authority our whole discussion decides. It is this *sympathy* as witnessed by man which "inaugurates a grand restorative, newly-creating movement in character;" it is this *sympathy* as experienced by God which renders such a movement possible.

Now, in his entire supposition of Christ's influence upon character, Dr. Bushnell is unscriptural; for, so far from teaching that the influence exerted by Christ upon man operates through common channels and is the "same that is obtained by human conduct under human methods," the New Testament expressly teaches that the influence of Christ upon His followers is supernatural in source, is a gift of the Holy Ghost, is an access of divine life by means of which, as in natural birth, a new spiritual birth is initiated, childhood passing at a bound into maturity, and winter into summer. But upon this point it is no part of our task to delay. To leave the lengthy disquisitions upon side issues, we have to inquire more particularly what is Dr. Bushnell's opinion as to the great contested question upon Christ's dealing with God on behalf of men.

By what influence upon God does the forgiveness of sins become possible? The reply is, by *vicarious sacrifice*, by the display of *sympathy;* but a *sacrifice* and a *sympathy* displaying itself in such a way as to exert a reconciling force upon the sympathizer. This theory of forgiveness by self-propitiation is a little startling. Finding in human nature the fact that man feels himself unable to grant an unconditional forgiveness to any one who has injured him until a certain wounded susceptibility is first overcome, and finding in the spiritual history of man that such wounded susceptibility is best overcome by active beneficence in the injurer's behalf, Dr. Bushnell deliberately applies this common analogy from our moral nature to explain the action of God in Christ. God would forgive man of His unspeakable love; but there are certain antagonistic feelings which must be first propitiated, and these feelings are propitiated by the unparalleled beneficence of the cradle and the cross. Just as the national antipathy of the Good Samaritan could no longer have any existence with regard to the poor Jew he had succoured and saved, so God cannot hesitate to welcome the estranged sinner for whom He has suffered and died. This theory is unscriptural as well as astonishing, and any one who has followed our expositions in the former part of this book will be able to see for himself the invalidity of Bushnell's references to Hebrew, Greek, and English. As an analogy, this theory is interesting and instructive; as an induction from Scripture, it can have no claim to completeness.

Another recent deliverance upon the subject in hand is the deservedly popular "Congregational Union Lecture," by R. W. Dale.[1]

Holding it mischievous, as Dr. Dale says in his preface, "to construct a theory of the atonement on the basis of those descriptions of the death of Christ which represent it as a ransom for us, or as a propitiation for the sins of the world, or on phrases in which Christ is described as dying for us, or dying for our sins," it is proposed, first, to establish a fact (that there is a direct relation between the death of Christ and the

[1] The Congregational Union Lecture for 1875, *The Atonement.*

remission of sins); and, secondly (by the investigation of the principles and grounds of that relation), to construct a theory.

The fact that the death of Christ is the objective ground of the remission of sins, Dr. Dale sets himself to prove by an induction from the testimony of Christ and His apostles, and an induction conducted in a peculiar way. There are four methods of biblical proof commonly adopted, viz. by a classification of proof passages selected from any biblical writer, by a classification of proof passages promiscuously selected from an entire Testament, by an analysis of the doctrinal system of the several inspired writers, and by an analysis of the doctrinal system of the entire New Testament. The "Congregational Union Lecture" does not present its argument precisely in any of these forms. Believing that, "from the very nature of the apostolic writings, those truths which belong to the essence of the Christian creed are, for the most part, implied rather than explicitly stated," reliance is placed upon this teaching by implication. The unmentioned postulates of a habit of mind are held to be as conclusive as express statements and formal inference. "That the apostles regarded the death of Christ as a sacrifice and propitiation for the sins of the world appears in many passages, which yield no direct testimony to the doctrine; it sometimes determines the form and structure of an elaborate argument, which falls to pieces if this truth is denied; at other times it gives pathos and power to a practical appeal; it accounts for some of the misconceptions and misrepresentations of apostolic teaching; it explains the absence from the apostolic writings of very much we should certainly have found in them if the apostles had not believed that for Christ's sake, and not merely because of the effects on our hearts of what Christ has revealed, God grants us remission of sins."[1] It is true that the illustrations used by Dr. Dale to exemplify this indirect proof from the apostolic assumptions are peculiarly unfortunate; for, with respect to "the well-known passage on the Lord's Supper in the First Epistle to the Corinthians," a Romanist might reply that, so far from the fact "that in a church founded by the apostle himself a very short time before the Epistle was written, it should have been possible

[1] *The Atonement*, Introd. pp. 25, 26.

for the Lord's Supper to be associated with the disgraceful excesses which he rebukes, and that in rebuking them he makes no use of the awful argument which would have come at once to the lips of a priest of the Church of Rome or a Ritualistic priest of the Church of England," being "a proof, from which there is no appeal, that St. Paul had never taught and did not believe that the consecrated bread and wine were changed into the body and blood of Christ," the very solemnity with which the apostle endeavoured "to rescue" the sacred ordinance "from dishonour, and to secure its reverential celebration," the very "dread" with which the awful words, "Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord," invests this ordinance, are proofs the other way—at any rate, it is on record that the divines assembled at the Tridentine Council did so argue. Further, with respect to the indirect testimony which Dr. Dale finds to the divinity of Christ in St. John's words, "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God," does not Dr. Dale know that the undeveloped Gnostic heresy combated by the apostle was as antagonistic to the true Deity as to the true humanity of Jesus? The illustrations of the death of Christ as an atonement for sin are more happy;[1] in these, as he himself says truly enough in another work,[2] Dr. Dale has laid under tribute a source of information which had not been sufficiently heeded by the great masters of New Testament theology, and the result has been to obtain for his main thesis that probability which always attends a subject that has suddenly received support from an unexpected quarter, as when the undulatory theory of light was found to explain the novel phenomena of polarization and the newly-discovered rings of Newton. By far the most suggestive portions of these lectures are those which exemplify this method of proof by undesigned coincidences, so to speak; and the wish is almost involuntarily prompted that the lecturer had applied himself more persistently to this indirect, yet cogent, form of proof. As a matter of fact, however, the

[1] See pp. 20–26, 60–71, 84–88, 120–123, 179–185, 202–209, 246–249.

[2] *History of Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age*, Pref. to Eng. Trans. p. vii.

method of the examination of Scripture adopted by Dr. Dale is not this indirect one alone; for he relies for the establishment of his fact upon the *consensus* of the apostolic writings, that *consensus* being exhibited in *proof passages* as well as in passages "*which are inexplicable if his thesis be not granted.*" By the aid of this examination of texts, some of which prove by absence and some by presence, there are investigated in successive lectures the history of our Lord Jesus Christ in relation to the fact of the atonement, and in relation to the testimony of our Lord, the testimony of Peter, the testimony of James and John, and the testimony of the Apostle Paul, in each of which substantial evidence is found of the proposition that the death of Christ is the objective ground of the remission of sins. In a supplementary lecture the fact of the atonement is confirmed, the author believes, by a sketch of opinion upon the subject from the days of the Apostolic Fathers to those of Grotius; this sketch assuredly showing, it is thought, "that the Church did not come to believe in the objective value of the death of Christ because the doctrine had been developed in theological systems, but that theological systems were constructed in order to explain and justify the doctrine which the Church already believed."

But enough has been said upon the fact, and the method of establishing it; it is with the theory by which that fact is explained that we are more especially concerned. Here the scriptural standpoint is confessedly left for "an inquiry of transcendent speculative importance." And being met upon the threshold by a grave and startling difficulty, *whether the remission of sins is possible*, the theoretical examination is prefaced by a lengthy reply,[1] which, since it partakes largely of an *argumentum ad hominem* directed against Dr. Young, may be here passed over. The theory of the atonement advanced by Dr. Dale has for its aim, he tells us, "to discover why it is the remission of sins is granted to men on the ground of the death of Christ?"[2] In more detail, having stated that, according to the New Testament, "there are three considerations which invest the death of Christ with unique and tragic interest,—viz. first, it was the death of the Son of God—of

[1] *The Atonement*, Lecture viii. [2] *Ibid.* p. 355.

God manifest in the flesh; second, it was a voluntary death; third, immediately before death, Jesus was forsaken by God," —Dr. Dale proposes to investigate the connection between this mysterious death and the remission of the sins of men by arguing two questions: first, "*Whether this connection can be explained by the existence of any original relation existing between the Lord Jesus Christ and the penalties of sin?*" or, to state the question more generally, "*between the Lord Jesus Christ and the eternal law of righteousness, of which sin is the transgression?*" and, secondly, "*Whether this connection can be explained by any original relation between the Lord Jesus Christ and the race whose sins needed remission?*" [1]

"What, then," asks Dr. Dale in his ninth lecture, "is the relation between the Lord Jesus Christ and the penalties of sin?" or, more generally, "the eternal law of righteousness, of which sin is the transgression?" His answer is, first, that there are authoritative statements on the part of our Lord and His apostles, which assert that the penalties of sin are to be inflicted by Christ, since this function of judgeship is part of a larger function,—that *Jesus Christ is the moral Ruler of the universe, moral responsibility is responsibility to Him.*[2] Then, in the second place, not satisfied with the scriptural reply, the whole subject is approached in another way, by a singular admixture of scriptural, ethical, and analogical argument. The relation between Christ and law is first investigated; to this we proceed, simply premising that it is much to be wished that the clear speech and lucid reasoning commonly so characteristic of the lecturer, had been a little more conspicuous here.

The investigation into the relation between Christ and law consists of four steps, viz. a postulate that Christ is God, and three arguments, partly speculative and partly scriptural—viz. first, an inquiry into the relation between God and the eternal law of righteousness; secondly, an inquiry into the relation between God and the punishment of sin; and, thirdly, into the relation between God and the ill-desert of a man who has transgressed the eternal law of righteousness.

What is said upon the relation between God and the eternal

[1] *The Atonement*, pp. 360, 361. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 362, 363.

law of righteousness is the result of an examination of the familiar theological problem, whether God is above law or law above God. "All Christians, all theists, acknowledge that God is the moral Ruler of mankind and the whole moral universe; what does this acknowledgment imply? Does it imply that the will of God . . . is the origin of the antithesis between right and wrong, and the ultimate ground of moral obligation?"[1] This hypothesis is incredible, it is maintained, for several reasons. If it were true, for example, it would be difficult to account for the recognition of moral obligation where the existence of God is denied or doubted; yet there is a conscience in man, there is a sense the exclusive prerogative of which it is to make moral distinctions; nor does conscience invoke the authority of God before condemning vice and approving virtue; conscience confesses that the law of righteousness, the obligation to do what is right, has an eternal and necessary authority. Further, if the will of God were the source of moral distinctions, it would be impossible to love and reverence God because of His moral excellence; there can be no reason for celebrating the glory of His justice, if, had He so pleased, injustice would have been equally glorious; God can have no moral perfection, if the distinction between good and evil is the creation of the divine will. Again, righteousness is the fulfilment of moral obligations, but moral obligations can never be originated by mere will, even if that will be the will of God; duty is inconceivable if moral obligation does not exist antecedently to the divine commands. The will of God not being then the source of moral distinctions, are those distinctions the consequence of some law, independent and supreme, claiming allegiance from the Creator as well as the creature? The hypothesis is instinctively rejected; even in idea nothing can be higher than God. The solution may possibly be found, Dr. Dale thinks, in a statement of the actual history of our ideas of righteousness and God. Man, at man's estate, possesses a moral faculty which asserts that the distinction between good and evil is the expression of an eternal and necessary law; man, at man's estate, is also capable of knowing God when revealed to him as a living Person Who possesses the same august and supreme

[1] *The Atonement*, p. 364.

authority which conscience confesses in the eternal law of righteousness; "the relation between God and the eternal law of righteousness is therefore unique; He is not, as we are, bound by its authority; in Him its authority is actively asserted." [1] This, then, is the result of this elaborate show of reasoning: God is neither the source nor the servant of the eternal law of righteousness; "in Him the authority of this eternal law is actively asserted," whatever that may mean. We shall return to this presently; for the moment it is our desire to state Dr. Dale's argument.

The relation between God and the penalties of sin is next considered, the scrutiny of this question partly taking the form of an analogical argument from the nature of punishment as justly inflicted by human law. Punishment is not a simple reformatory process; for such a view involves the most grotesque consequences, and consequences repugnant to our most elementary moral convictions. Nor is punishment awarded for its deterrent effects, that it may be an additional motive to obedience. Nor is punishment a simple assertion of magisterial or regal rights. "The only conception of punishment which satisfies our strongest and most definite moral convictions, and which corresponds to the place it occupies in the organization of society and in the moral order of the universe, is that which represents it as pain and loss inflicted for the violation of a law; [2] if the law is a righteous law, if the severity of the penalty is not out of proportion to the magnitude of the offence, the punishment is just; the offender has deserved what he suffers; . . . that the suffering inflicted is deserved, is a necessary element in the conception of punishment."

The next point is the relation of God to the ill-desert of a man who has transgressed the eternal law of righteousness, and to the suffering which may justly come upon him for his transgression; in other words, must God inflict the penalties which sin has deserved? To this question "the Christian revelation and the irrepressible instincts of our moral and spiritual nature" reply in the affirmative; God would not be God if infringement of the eternal law of righteousness re-

[1] *The Atonement*, p. 372. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 383, 384.

mained unpunished. But a further question arises: "Must punishment of necessity fall upon the wrong-doer?" "Not necessarily," is Dr. Dale's reply; for, according to human analogies, "*whatever moral element there is in punishment itself as punishment, is derived from the person or power that inflicts it.*"[1] "Hence, if in any case the penalties of sin are remitted, some other divine act of at least equal intensity, and in which the ill-desert of sin is expressed with at least equal energy, must take its place."[2] So much may be concluded *a priori*. The Christian atonement is the fulfilment of that necessity.

The first portion of Dr. Dale's theory, which has for its purpose to explain the connection between the death of Christ and the remission of sins, may be stated, then, as follows:— Christ is God; in God the eternal law of righteousness, given in conscience, is and must be actively asserted; punishment or pain or loss is the means by which the eternal law of righteousness is divinely asserted when that law is infringed; if, in any case, the penalties of sin are remitted, some other divine act of at least equal intensity, and in which the ill-desert of sin is expressed with at least equal energy, must take its place; such an act (of equal intensity at least with the punishment of the wrong-doer) is the death on Golgotha; by the death of Christ, therefore, sins may be forgiven, inasmuch as He to whom it belongs in His judicial capacity to inflict punishment, in order to uphold the eternal law of righteousness, Himself endures suffering, and so satisfies the claims of the eternal law: which substantially is the Moderate Calvinist, Modern Arminian or Governmental view of the atonement.

The second portion of Dr. Dale's theory follows upon the consideration of the second question proposed, concerning the relation between the Lord Jesus Christ and the race whose sins needed remission. This is the subject of the tenth lecture. This relation of Christ to mankind is part, it is said, of a larger question—the relation of Christ to the created universe; still it is sufficient to consider the specific relation of Christ to the human race. Now, it had been matter of knowledge to the apostles that their Christian life and all its prerogatives and hopes had come to them through Christ, and were not the

[1] *The Atonement*, p. 386. [2] *Ibid.* p. 391.

immediate effect of the Father's power and love; hence it would appear they believed, at any rate they testified, that in Christ all things consist; Christ is the representative of the Christian Church in this sense, that He is the life and power of the Church: "We dwell in Him, He dwells in us, and He is the living prophecy of the height and glory of our holiness;"[1] "'Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches: He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for apart from me ye can do nothing.' This is an exhaustive statement of the truth; to this neither saint nor apostle can add anything; we truly live only as we live in Christ."[2] Out of this relation to Christ arises the relation of the Christian to the Father: through Christ's original, eternal, and unique relationship to the Father, His followers are raised into a fellowship with God, which renders possible a freedom and blessedness of communion with Him which is unspeakable and full of glory. In short, it is the testimony of Scripture (corroborated, too, by the Christian consciousness) that "the power and perfections of our moral and spiritual life are a perpetual revelation of the power and perfection of the life of Christ;" further, that "our relation to the Father is determined by the relation of Christ to the Father."[3]

These investigations into the relations of Christ to law and humanity enable, in the esteem of the Congregational Union lecturer, a theory of the atonement to be constructed. The general outlines of that theory may be stated in four propositions. The death of Christ is the objective ground on which sins are remitted (we condense and change the order of Dr. Dale's propositions), first, because that death was a revelation of the righteousness of God which must otherwise have been revealed in the infliction of the penalties of sin upon the human race; secondly, because, in consequence of the relation between Christ and His followers, the submission of Christ to the righteous authority of the law expresses and involves that

[1] *The Atonement*, p. 414. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 418, 419.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 420.

of His disciples; thirdly, because that death rendered possible the retention or the recovery of the original and ideal relation of man to God through Christ, which sin had dissolved, and the loss of which was the supreme penalty of transgression; and, fourthly, because that death involved the actual destruction of sin in all those who through faith recover their union with the Father.[1]

The first criticism which is suggested by this theory of the Congregational Union lecturer, is the erroneous meaning attached, as has so often been done during the course of the study of the atonement, to the word *theory*. *Theory* is not used in the scientific sense of *generalization* or *hypothesis*, but in the metaphysical sense of *something that explains*. Dr. Dale speaks, indeed, somewhat slightingly of "theological theories" which are "empirical classifications of Scripture texts,"[2] apparently including in his censure those theories which accurately express and colligate empirical classifications of Scripture texts. True, he seems to define a theory as an "accurate intellectual expression;"[3] but when we ask, of what? the reply seems to be, amidst considerable verbiage and inconsistency, an accurate intellectual expression of what has been immediately revealed to the spirit.[4] Dr. Dale certainly does not recognise as a theory of the death of Christ "the accurate intellectual expression" of the united testimonies of Scripture. A reference to his actual use of the word *theory* shows that the idea attached by him to the word would seem to be *something that explains*. Thus, in one place it is said "that these four propositions include a complete *theory* of the relation of the death of Christ to the remission of sins: I am not presumptuous enough to imagine, but if they can be sustained they offer *some explanation* of the great fact that the death of Christ did not merely manifest the infinite mercy of God," etc.[5] Again, on the very threshold of the study of the theory of the atonement, it is said that the object is "*to discover why* it is that the remission of sins is granted to men on the ground of the death of Christ."[6] Now it is not the *why*

[1] *The Atonement*, pp. 430–432.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 18.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 19.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 18.
[5] *Ibid.* p. 432.
[6] *Ibid.* p. 355.

but the *how* that is the object of search of the inductive method. The Congregational Union lecturer's use of the word "theory" makes it evident that he has not yet learned to apply the inductive method to theology, and, Scripture being divine revelation, to ask simply, What does Scripture say?

To illustrate the futility of the speculative method, where the atonement of Jesus is concerned (which is a pure matter of revelation), the theory of the Congregational Union lecturer must take the place of "the melancholy example." *What is proven in Dr. Dale's theory is proven by Scripture, and what is unscriptural is unproven.* The elaborate show of reasoning is only cogent when it is a bare re-statement of scriptural assertions, and the lengthy parade of ethical principles is a pile of premises which simply repeat and do not prove the foregone conclusion! We appeal to the details of the theory in illustration.

For the proof of the postulate in the first half of his argument, that which concerns the relation between Christ and law, Dr. Dale confessedly appeals to Scripture. Does he any less appeal to Scripture in the three stages of his subsequent inquiry? Let us see.

The relation between God and the eternal law of righteousness is first examined, and what is said? That the will of God is not the origin of the eternal law of righteousness, nor is God the involuntary servant of that law, but in God that law is actively asserted. On what grounds are these statements made? On three, presumably:—First, "that the will of God is not the origin of the antithesis between right and wrong; for were goodness good only because God commands it, or evil evil because God forbids it, it would be difficult to account for the recognition of moral obligation where the existence of God is doubted or denied." Why so? What would Dr. Dale say to a parallel argument: "If life is life, and death is death, only because in God we live and move and have our being, it would be difficult to account for the sense of life where the existence of God is doubted or denied"? Surely God might be "the origin of the antithesis between right and wrong," and He might implant in man a faculty analogous to His own, the working of which might be quite irrespective of belief

in His existence. Further, it is argued that "righteousness is the fulfilment of moral obligations, and moral obligations can never be originated by mere will, even if that will be the will of God;" but how does Dr. Dale know this? Is he arguing from human analogy? If he is arguing from analogy, who has introduced him into such an intimate acquaintance with the secrets of the divine attributes and counsels, that by his unaided reason, quite apart from any revelation, he is enabled to argue from the commonplace of human volition to the rationally unknowable volition of the unapproachable God? We do not care to follow him in his singular analysis of a duty which precedes the divine commands; his argument, by the way, requires what he soon after sets himself to combat —a duty which precedes the divine existence; all we say is this, Where does Dr. Dale obtain his knowledge of the divine will? If from the Bible, what good reason can be given for endeavouring to shore the divine revelation by the speculations of human reason? A further argument employed by Dr. Dale is, that we "instinctively reject" the idea that the law of righteousness is "independent and supreme, claiming allegiance from the Creator and His creatures." Again we ask, Why so? Do men, altogether apart from the knowledge acquired from the Scriptures, reject this idea? Assuredly not. But we join issue with Dr. Dale at the very outset of his speculations: "In God the eternal law of righteousness is actively asserted," is the conclusion at which he first arrives. We beg, with all respect, to ask five questions: First, Where does Dr. Dale obtain this knowledge of God? secondly, Where does he obtain his knowledge of the divine eternity? thirdly, Where does he obtain his knowledge of the divine righteousness? fourthly, Where does he obtain his knowledge of a law of righteousness? fifthly, Where does he obtain his knowledge of the eternity of that law?—all of which things are asserted in his proposition; for if there is no God, or if God be not eternal and be not righteous, or if there be no law of righteousness, or if that law of righteousness be not eternal, the law of righteousness cannot be eternally asserted in God. We presume that Dr. Dale would confess that his knowledge of God and the divine attributes had been acquired from revela-

tion, but would add that the existence and eternity of the law of righteousness is the unaided testimony of conscience. We cannot relinquish to him even this outwork of his argument. There is undoubtedly a faculty in man which judges of right and wrong, just as there is a faculty which distinguishes between light and dark, and a faculty which discriminates harmony and discord; the Congregational Union lecturer quotes approvingly those "noble words" of Butler: "There is a superior principle of reflection or conscience in every man, which distinguishes between the internal principles of the heart as well as his external actions, which passes judgment upon himself and them, pronounces determinately some actions to be in themselves just, right, and good, others to be in themselves evil, wrong, unjust, which, without being consulted, without being advised with, magisterially exerts itself and approves or condemns him, the doer of them, accordingly." Well and good; but the pupil goes beyond the master, and finds proof in the existence of conscience, not only of the existence of an adjudicator of right and wrong, but of the eternal existence of a law of righteousness. We quote his own words: "Even in the absence of the knowledge that God requires us to be righteous, conscience confesses that the law of righteousness has an eternal and necessary authority;" "Conscience, in the earliest and most rudimentary stages of its development, recognises in particular actions the distinction between good and evil, and affirms that the idea of goodness involves the obligation to be good; as conscience acquires clearness and strength of vision, it discovers, what was implicitly contained in its earliest judgments, that the distinction between good and evil is not arbitrary, contingent, and mutable, but *is the expression of an eternal and necessary law.*" Apart from Scripture, conscience does no such thing; apart from Scripture, an eternal law of righteousness—whether an objective or subjective law is meant by the term, to which we ought to conform—is not given in conscience. It might be as justly argued that an eternity of sunlight was guaranteed by the human eye. The fact is, that it is the divine revelation which takes the rudimentary promptings of conscience and imparts to them strength and objectivity. For our part, we

believe that Dr. Dale has introduced undesirable confusion into the study of the atonement by the use of this phrase, "the eternal law of righteousness." The scriptural testimony is that God is righteous, and this is at once simpler and less liable to confusion. Dr. Dale ought to avoid the reintroduction into theology of the old nominalist and realist controversies, and should have been on his guard against erecting into concreteness abstract names. Without the risk of arousing insoluble speculations upon the pre-existence or co-ordination of law and God (speculations which, after all, are but the premature deliveries of the inapt marriage of word and thought), the Scriptures simply assert that the attribute of righteousness, which man knows something about from the very nature of his spiritual constitution, exists in God. To say, "God is righteous," is decidedly to be preferred to saying, "In God the eternal law of righteousness is actively asserted."

Let us not be misunderstood. In Dr. Dale's conclusions we largely coincide; with him we say, "Christ is God, God is righteous; God displays His righteousness by punishing wrongdoers; God remits that punishment by the substitution of a divine act of at least equal intensity, and so remains righteous." What we assert is this, that all these statements are but re-statements of Scripture truths, and owe their validity not at all to reasonings from ethical principles or common analogies, but solely to the revelations of God in Holy Writ: the unaided reason of man did not give these truths, neither can it explain them; and so far from constituting a theory, they are the very things which a theory should embody.

With respect to the second portion of Dr. Dale's theory,—the relation of Christ to the human race,—he is there confessedly on Scripture ground, and does not pretend to gain any knowledge whatever from other sources. Reason is employed by him, to repeat the words of Bacon, "in the conception and apprehension of the mysteries of God to us revealed." Yet even in this chapter there is a lack of clearness of vision, and an undesirable hesitancy. The relations of the pre-existent Christ to the Father are expounded with considerable power, but become subsequently but one weight in a wavering

balance, the other being some intangible hypothesis about the second Adam.

All the elements of the atonement mentioned in these lectures have received their fitting place and due proportions in the theory previously advanced as the scriptural theory of the work of Christ in the remission of sins.

CHAPTER VI.

THE ATONEMENTS OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS COMPARED.

"Multum et solide significatur, ad Vetus Testamentum timorem potius pertinere . . . quamquam et in Vetere Novum lateat, et in Novo Vetus pateat."—AUGUSTINE, *Quæstiones in Exodum*, lxxiii.

NOW that the lengthy disquisition upon the nature of that work of Christ which rendered possible a remission of sins — that is to say, upon what is commonly called the atonement — is concluded, rapid progress may be made in the settlement of the New Testament doctrine of Sacrifice.

And, in the first place, be it observed again, how readily the atoning work of Christ could be figuratively expressed under imagery drawn from the Old Testament ceremonial. Indeed, to any one who has familiarized himself with the general features of the Mosaic sacrificial cultus, it comes naturally, as it were, to depict the atonement of Jesus under the rich symbolism of the Tabernacle and the Temple. How facile, then, must such an imagery have been to the apostles! Born and bred in the days of the gorgeous ritual of the Herodian Temple, their every patriotic and religious feeling inseparably associated with the glory and beauty of their divinely-inspired faith, how readily must the pictorial effects of the Temple service have been enlisted in the proclamation of things in any way analogous! The whole system of the Hebrew rites, complicated and grand, had so filled the eyes, possessed the imaginations, and engrossed the hearts of the apostles in the most plastic years of their life, it had so constituted their business and composed their relaxation, it had been so cherished as their dearest treasure and fostered as their fondest hope, that the very reverence and sanctity which had gathered around the faith of their childhood give

the assurance that this sublime and familiar worship would be to them emblematic of all that was truest and deepest and most lasting in religion. The Jew would find figures of speech in the Levitical sacrifices with as little effort as the Romanist does in the Mass, or the Englishman in the British Constitution.[1]

And, as a matter of fact, it is abundantly evident from the New Testament, that the rites of Judaism did lend themselves with peculiar ease to the communication of the first principles of Christianity. The sacrifices of the Old Testament provided a convenient phraseology to the early preachers of the gospel for describing the *averruncatio mali* and the *acquisitio boni* which were the prominent subjects of their discourse. Whether we coincide or not in the startling opinion, that "there were no types in nature out of which, as roots, the words could grow that would signify a matter so entirely supernatural as the gracious work and incarnate mystery of Christ," and that, as a consequence, "the only way to get a language for him at all was to prepare it artificially,"[2] we may, however, unhesitatingly say, with the author of that opinion, that the rites and ceremonies of the ancient faith of Moses, David, and Isaiah provided "a new nomenclature of figures for the sacrifice of the Son."[3] As the same thought has been more tersely put: "The institutions of the Old Testament are, to a large extent, a dictionary in which I learn the true sense of the language of the New."[4] Whatever theory is entertained with respect to the precise relation between the fundamental maxims of Judaism and those of Christianity,—and it will be our duty presently to fix that relation with some degree of exactitude,—it is allowed by all, by Socinian and Calvinist alike, that the rites instituted at Sinai were largely employed by the apostles to convey by figure what the work of Christ disclosed by fact.

Indeed, all the classes of Levitical injunctions are employed in the New Testament to describe the atoning work of Christ. There are, that is to say, two points to be insisted on with

[1] Compare Lowth, *Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews*, Lecture viii.
[2] Bushnell, *The Vicarious Sacrifice*, p. 392. [3] *Ibid.* p. 403.
[4] Dale, *The Jewish Temple and the Christian Church*, p. 146.

reference to the connection between the Old and New Covenants,—viz. in the first place, that the work of Christ may be figuratively delineated by means of the sacrificial rites of the Tabernacle or Temple; and, in the second place, that the work of Christ is not so delineated simply in a figurative manner. "The language of the New Testament does not contain mere *figurative* allusions to the Jewish sacrifices, but ascribes a *real* and *immediate* efficacy to Christ's death, an efficacy corresponding to that which was anciently produced by the legal sin-offerings."[1] The latter point is for the moment reserved; it is with the former point—the possibility of bringing old associations to bear in instilling the gospel of Christ—that we are at present concerned. Any analogy, however distant, will be evidence in illustration. The sacrificial ritual of the Old Testament afforded figurative language for the expression of the principles of Christianity, just as did the relation of master and slave, the marriage ceremonies, the customs of the market-place, the privileges of the home, the precedents of the courts of justice, the splendours and immunities of the State.

The Tabernacle and its succeeding Temples were the visible embodiments to the Jew of the presence of Jehovah, the house in which Jehovah dwelt, the palace from which He issued His commands and dispensed His benignities; what step, then, was more easy than to find in the Tabernacle or in the Temple a figure of the supereminent character of Christ? Jesus was the Emmanuel, the Word made flesh, the effulgence of the Father's glory, the impress of His person, who had humbled Himself to take the form of a servant; might He not be called a nobler Shechinah—a Tabernacle without an iota of pretence? So we actually find John saying, "The Word became flesh," and "*tabernacled* amongst us;"[2] and our Lord Himself said, speaking as we are informed of His blessed body, "Destroy this *temple*, and in three days I will raise it up."[3]

Then the divisions of the sacred structure of Judaism

[1] Veysie, *Bampton Lectures on the Atonement*, Sermon v.

[2] John i. 14: ἐσκήνωσεν. Σκηνή is the common Septuagint equivalent for the Tabernacle.

[3] John ii. 19.

afforded a peculiar imagery. The life of Christ on earth was, as regarded its intercourse with the Father, a life at some distance: to pray on the mountain-top or in the garden was not to converse in the immediate presence; the advent of angels was exceptional — they were not ever on the wing to do the Saviour's bidding; having assumed our nature, He was bound by its limitations and debility. But all this was the very contrast offered so boldly by the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies. The earthly life of Jesus may be aptly described as a worship *without the veil;* His resurrection life is a life *within the veil.* And such an imagery comes frequently to the apostolic lips. The cross is the altar upon which Jesus makes His sacrifice. His body is a greater and more perfect tabernacle, by means of which, in the days of His flesh, He approaches the Most High.[1] The *veil* of His flesh is torn asunder that He may enter upon His work of heavenly intercession.[2] Death to Him is the entrance, not into the holy places made by hands, the figures of the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the real and no longer the symbolical "presence of God" for us.[3] Then how often the place of the immediate presence of God and the Lamb is described in the apocalyptic visions as the inmost shrine of the Temple![4] How often is the place where intercession is made designated the altar![5]

Further, what could more vividly express the sacrificial and intercessory work of Jesus than the office of the Jewish priesthood? The priests had been elected by God, under the Old Covenant, to the privileges and duties of divine approach, prayers on the lips and gifts in the hands; theirs also was the right of intercession; and, at once allied to God and man, it was their high honour, as if themselves exalted above the guilt and pollution of transgression, to plead on behalf of human sin, and, as if admitted to the counsels of the Most High, to convey the assurance of the divine forgiveness and the divine favour; theirs, too, it was to mitigate the divine anger by the shedding of blood, and to dispense the divine charity in the

[1] Heb. ix. 11, xiii. 10. [2] Heb. x. 20. [3] Heb. ix. 24.
[4] Rev. viii. 4, 5, xi. 1, 2, 19, xiv. 18, xv. 5, xxi. 3, 22.
[5] Rev. vi. 9, viii. 3, 5, ix. 13, xi. 1, xiv. 18, xvi. 7.

presentation of sacrifice: in the high priest these offices of intercession and mediation were concentrated. Now, how could any converted Jew ignore the analogy between the new and the old? Was it not the very essence of the work of the Messiah, whom he had now come to recognise in Jesus of Nazareth, that He was at once the highest representative of God and the noblest representative of man, and that, possessing in greater measure all the attributes of the ancient priesthood, He had bestowed His very self in the offering of sacrifice and the discharge of priestly duties? The presentation of Himself on Calvary was, so to speak, the priestly presentation in His white robes at the altar on the great Day of Atonement. Who like Him could plead before God the merits of a sacrifice like His? Who could pass like Him within the veil, and present a sacrifice beneath the gaze of angels and in the very presence of the Almighty? Who could bring such messages of mercy as He from the dread throne of the "I AM"? What names, then, so appropriate for the great worker of salvation as "Priest," "the Priest," "the Priest for ever,"[1] "our great High Priest," "fatherless, motherless, without length of days or end of life, the Priest eternal after the order of Melchisedek"?[2] There was not a soul that had been trained in the rites of Judaism but would consciously or unconsciously acknowledge the vividness of the apostolic argument, whether or not understanding ended in acceptance: "Having therefore boldness to enter into the Holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which He has consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, His flesh; and having a High Priest over the house of God: let us draw near."[3]

So also the rites of purification would provide a convenient phraseology for the frustration of original sin by the work of Christ. His it was, as part of the effects of His great work, "to cleanse the leprous," "to purify the heart," "to purify unto Himself a peculiar people;" His it was "to purge our sins," "to purge our conscience from dead works," "to purge

[1] Heb. v. 6 (compare Ps. cx. 4 in the Septuagint), vii. 17, 21, viii. 4, x. 21.

[2] Heb. ii. 17, iii. 1, iv. 14, v. 10, vi. 20, vii. 26, viii. 1, ix. 11.

[3] Heb. x. 19-21.

us from the consciousness of sin;" His it was to "cleanse from all sin" and to "cleanse from all unrighteousness."[1]

And it is axiomatic how readily the atoning work of Christ fell into *sacrificial* forms. There was not a detail in the sacrificial ritual, not a variety of presentation, not a peculiarity of selection, which might not be enlisted in the conveyance of some important feature of Christ's work. The generic characteristics of sacrificing have their pictorial power; and the specific characteristics of the several varieties and rituals have a similar power peculiarly their own.

Jesus was the great sacrifice, in a different sense to Bushnell's. He gave Himself to God. His willing obedience to the Father's behests, His persistent execution of the Father's will, through humiliation and poverty, limitation and solitude, —this was a gift of the purest and truest and most costly kind.

Then, too, Jesus was the great atonement. He was the divinely provided "covering" for human sin. And when attention is directed to the atoning features of His stupendous work, it was in the fact that by His life,—His blood,—He wrought the beneficial change in the relations between God and man, that a point of union is found with the Mosaic atonement, and the most impressive feature of the ancient worship is rendered tributary. Without "shedding of blood" there was no remission under the Old Covenant, and without "shedding of blood" there is no remission under the New; so it is not wonderful that the "blood of Jesus" became prominently employed as a *précis* of the great subject of Christian teaching; and the cardinal doctrine of Mosaism became, in the earnest and reiterated appeals of Christian missionaries, the channel for the diffusion of the cardinal doctrine of Christianity. It was the "shedding of His blood" which Christ Himself memorialized in the Eucharist; it is "the blood of Christ" which Paul proclaims as the instrument of justification, redemption, adoption, sanctification; it is to "the blood of Christ" that Peter appeals in illustration of the costliness of sin; it is "the blood of Christ" which John

[1] Matt. viii. 3, xi. 5; Acts xv. 9; Titus ii. 14; Heb. i. 3, ix. 14, x. 2; 1 John i. 7, 9.

regards as the pledge of the purification of the inmost fountains of life; and it was "the blood of Christ" in which, in the visions of the Revelation, the garments of the blessed were washed.[1] An illustration more pertinent to the Jewish mind of the validity and power of Christ's death could not be found.

Every element in the sacrificial ritual would also furnish an appropriate series of images. When Jesus offered Himself to obtain salvation for mankind, whether in the eternal counsels of heaven or on the historical stage of earth, what was this but the *presentation* of His sacrifice? As the words fall upon the ear, "Father, the hour is come; glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son also may glorify Thee," is it not as if He Who was at once offerer and victim is attesting the reality of His desire to sacrifice Himself by an *imposition of the hand?* What is it but the *slaughter* as the cry rings forth, "It is finished"? Was ever *manipulation with the blood* like that when He passed within the veil to present before the eternal throne the merits of His completed sacrifice? What but the *act of cremation* is the universal honour bestowed by the Father upon the Son? And is not that *a sacrificial feast* indeed, when the believer, in all his sins and in all his temptations, rests in faith upon the one Sacrifice, and eats the flesh and drinks the blood of the Son of man?

Every variety of the Old Testament sacrifice may be made beautifully illustrative of certain aspects of Christ's work. Christ is the true sin-offering: "Who needeth not daily to offer up sacrifice, first for His own sin, and then for the people's: for this He did once, when He offered up Himself."[2] Christ is the true trespass-offering: "Who gave Himself a ransom for all."[3] Christ is the true burnt-offering: "An offering and an atonement to God for a sweet-smelling savour."[4] Christ is the true peace-offering: as Simeon said, "Mine eyes

[1] Matt. xxvi. 28; Mark xiv. 24; Luke xxii. 20; 1 Cor. xi. 25; Acts xx. 28; Rom. iii. 25, v. 9; 1 Cor. x. 16, xi. 25, 27; Eph. i. 7, ii. 13; Col. i. 14 (in the *Textus Receptus*), i. 20; Heb. ix. 14, 20, x. 19, 29, xiii. 12, 20; 1 Pet. i. 2, 19; 1 John i. 7, v. 6, 8; Rev. i. 5, v. 9, vii. 14, xii. 11, xix. 13.

[2] Heb. vii. 26, 27, ix. 24–28, x. 8–12, 14, 18. [3] 1 Tim. ii. 6.

[4] Eph. v. 2; comp. Gen. viii. 21, Lev. i. 9, 13, 17, and many other passages in the Septuagint.

have seen Thy peace-offering."[1] Christ is the Paschal Lamb.[2] Christ is the Lamb of God.[3] There is not a sacrificial element of the Old Testament, in short, which, without strain of language, might not be applied in illustration of some feature in the character of the work of the most prominent figure in the New Testament.

From the analogy, too, to Moses, who had been divinely commissioned to impart the Sinaitic faith, with its half lights and neutral tints, Jesus, the Light of the World, the Sun of Righteousness, is called "the Mediator of a better covenant."[4]

Then, before we pass away from these figurative allusions to the work of Christ, a word or two will not be misplaced upon the work of Christ when viewed as a "ransom" or "redemption." This is a very common mode of expression in the New Testament, and is of course connected with the Old Testament ideas of "ransoming," as displayed in the trespass-offering and other ceremonial acts. Occasionally, it is true, the class of words which bear this common significance follow the analogies of all language, and simply express the general idea of deliverance; in many cases, however, it is evident that the more limited idea of deliverance after the payment of an equivalent value is signified. This conception of equivalent payment was exceedingly familiar to the Jew, as we have seen again and again. What wonder was it, then, that He who had effected our deliverance from sin and punishment by the precious gift of His own life, should have been said to have "bought" us with His own blood, to have "redeemed" us with His blood, to have been our "ransom"?[5]

But, manifest as it is that a ready language is found in the Levitical system for conveying the several aspects and moments of the atonement of Jesus, is this all that can be said? Or is there any closer relation between the atoning symbols of the Old Testament and the atoning fact of the New Testament? The consideration of this question will

[1] Luke ii. 30.
[2] 1 Cor. v. 7.
[3] John i. 29; 1 John iii. 5.
[4] Heb. viii. 6.
[5] Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45; Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 6; Titus ii. 14; Heb. ix. 12; 1 Pet. i. 18.

complete the doctrine of Atonement as taught in Holy Scripture.

It has been seen in the study of the Mosaic worship that its several rites were at once symbolical and typical,—in other words, that they were symbolical of truths then actually revealed, and symbolical of revelations yet to be made; it has been seen, in fact, that those rites of the pre-Christian times were material embodiments of certain doctrines which in more appropriate and harmonious form the future should produce. It has also been seen, in the review of the New Testament testimonies, that that work of Christ was designated sacrificial which found its necessity in the righteous Being of God and in the fallen nature of man, was actually a vicarious bearing of the punishment decreed from the first upon sin, and resulted in such a reconciliation between the holy God and sinful man that the consequences of the Fall might be obliterated. It has been further seen that the moments of the work of Christ in human redemption were designated under a variety of figures derived from the Old Testament worship, because the elements of that worship lent themselves with a singular appropriateness, more readily perceptible to the apostles than to us, to the communication of the first principles of the new faith. The question previously started may now, therefore, be disposed of,—whether this description of the work of Christ, and especially of His death, under sacrificial analogies, was anything more than figurative? whether such a description was based on a fleeting and intangible resemblance, or on something more? whether this facility of pictorial representation resulted from a pre-ordained connection between the two dispensations? whether, to be brief, this sacrificial work of Christ was that final and complete work for which the pre-Christian dispensations had been preparing the way —the *antitype*, to use a technicality previously defined, of which the Patriarchal and Mosaic rituals were the *types?*

At the risk of prolixity, it will be advantageous to recapitulate the exact difference represented by *type* and *antitype*. Type and antitype do not mean different things under the same form, but the same thing under different forms. Type and antitype are so related to each other by a pre-established

harmony, that the type teaches by figure what the antitype teaches by fact. The type indeed suggests in spite of a large pretence, what the antitype displays without pretence. The type had an extrinsic, the antitype an intrinsic, merit. The analogy between the symbol and the thing symbolized may be faint and arbitrary in the type; in the antitype the distinction between the symbol and the thing symbolized has vanished, and distant analogy has become perfect induction.[1]

It is evident, therefore, that if the New Testament use of sacrificial terminology is anything more than figurative,—if the sacrificial conceptions of the apostles are the substance of which the rites of Moses and the patriarchs were the shadows,—then a comparison of the sacrificial worship of the Old and New Testament should show that the sacrifices of the New are embodiments, without anything of accommodation or mere institution, of those truths which the sacrifices of the Old represented with considerable latitude, nay, are those very truths themselves. If the sacrificial doctrine of the New Testament is that more perfect form for which the doctrine of Mosaism paved the way, then the former should show itself upon analysis to be that related form to which the latter pointed. In short, if these several forms of doctrine are indeed related as type and antitype, comparison should disclose this relation. To such comparison we proceed, restricting ourselves in the present instance *to the atonements effected under the two Covenants.*

Let the question be re-stated. The Scriptures speak of two methods of atonement, which is, being interpreted, of *covering*, of *neutralizing* sin, of so *rendering* sin *inert* that it ceases to arouse the righteous anger of God, and thus becomes the means of restoring communion between the creature and Creator.[2] These two methods of atonement may, without much danger of misunderstanding, be generally termed the Mosaic and the Christian. The Mosaic method—we are at present concerned simply with its objective side—was by the legal manipulation of animal blood, legal correctness consisting in an obedient fulfilment of an appointed ritual, the leading features of which were eminently adapted to express symboli-

[1] See pp. 162–164.

[2] See pp. 101 and 144, etc.

cally that the life of an animal physically immaculate had become, when presented before God, the instrument in obtaining remission of sins. The Christian method of atonement was, as it is figuratively put so frequently, by the blood of Christ,—that is to say, by that surrender of life on the part of the sinless Emmanuel which was a vicarious endurance of the penalty decreed by God upon the sin of man. The question is, "Are these two modes of atonement related to each other as type and antitype?"

Several considerations suggest the probability of that conclusion; for, in the first place, the Mosaic Law itself did not profess to be a final revelation, and distinctly pointed to a future time for an explanation of its difficulties. The Law gave no immediate replies to the numberless problems which it seemed constructed to insinuate. As we have previously said, in slightly different words, it aroused the mind by many a piece of inconsequent reasoning, it suggested possible solutions of numerous difficulties in the far future, it told a mystic and eluding tale to the imaginative and spiritually-minded, but it had no express statements upon the most perplexing details of its ritual to be read by all and mastered without special preparation. The Jew who had any faith at all in the divine origin of the Mosaic worship might rest, as he presented his sacrifice of blood, with priceless spiritual advantage upon the divine words, "I have given it to you on the altar to make an atonement for your souls;" upon any final cause of such gifts he might speculate endlessly, he could not fathom beyond question; nevertheless, he could not ignore the fact that, if the word of his God stood sure, this sanguinary worship was transitional, and was preparing the way for an atonement yet to come.

Secondly, the entire announcements of the prophets tended to deepen the sense of the transitional nature of Mosaism, and its method of atonement. "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord," wrote Jeremiah, "that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although

I was a husband to them, saith the Lord: but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel: After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord; for I will forgive them their iniquity, and I will remember their sins no more."[1] To which closing words the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews expressively adds, when quoting them: "Where there is remission of these, there is no more offering for sin."[2]

Thirdly, the prophetic intimations of the Old Testament, besides intensifying the popular apprehension of the transitional nature of Mosaism, made announcements concerning the coming kingdom of God which received a literal fulfilment in the death of Christ. We refer, of course, to the series of Messianic prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Zechariah, and Malachi, which have been passed under brief review in the preceding book. Thus, as has been seen, Isaiah, in his climacteric prophecy, spoke of the Branch, at once Mighty God and Son of a virgin, the Servant of Jehovah, Who, knowing no sin, would offer His life as a trespass-offering; and Daniel announced the very year of the crucifixion of Jesus as the time when reconciliation should be made for iniquity, and sacrifice of the Old Testament form should cease for ever. To such minute prophecies (on any theory of their authorship at any rate antecedent to the birth of Christ), and to such exact fulfilment, considerable argumentative force is justly attached.

Fourthly, the New Testament represents the whole code of Christianity as fulfulling the entire code of the preceding dispensations. Jesus Himself speaks of *fulfilling* the Law. He acknowledged its divine origin; He quotes its precepts as irrefutable testimony; He refers men to the commandments, as pointing out to them the path of life; He derives from the Law dogmatic witness to the truth; and yet He claims to

[1] Jer. xxxi. 31-34. [2] Heb. x. 17.

fulfil the Law,—that is to say, to repeat the Law in so altered a form as to render it obsolete.[1] And this *fulfilment* is peculiarly visible in the ceremonial features. The Old Testament worship is everywhere considered in the New as a means to an end, that end being the truth as it is in Jesus, or, as that introductory ceremonial has been elsewhere denominated, as a primer carefully accommodated to the previous acquirements of its learners, and preparatory to the more explicit, reasonable, and permanent education of the Christian system. "Weak through materialism," "a shadow of coming events,' "a pedagogue to lead the way to Christ," were the New Testament criticisms upon Mosaism; and such sentiments are the keys to the Christian conception of the previous revelations.[2]

Fifthly, the Mosaic and Christian methods of atonement are so universal as to be mutually exclusive. If one is trusted to, the other cannot be. Putting aside the Mosaic distinction of race, and the Christian absence of any such distinction, it remains true that the atonements by the blood of animals and by the blood of Christ achieved forgiveness for the same class of persons, and for those alone. By the atoning rites of Judaism, national and personal, forgiveness was obtained for all sins which were not committed in open rebellion against the Most High; the atonement of Christ obtained forgiveness for the same class of sins, and was powerless to claim forgiveness for deliberately, wilfully, and determinedly unrepenting offenders. Thus, then, the singular fact arises, that at different times in the history of the world, divine revelations were made of methods of forgiveness, for exactly the same classes of sins, essentially different in their nature. If a Jew was forgiven by the merits of the Mosaic method of atonement alone, he stood in no need of the atonement of Jesus; if a Christian was forgiven by the merit of the death of Christ for him, the Jewish ritual of sin-offerings was supererogatory. Does it not seem to follow that, if both methods of forgiveness were of divine origin, they must have been

[1] Compare the very able chapters on "The Gospel and the Law" and "Of the Law" and "Of the Gospel," in the first and second volumes of Reuss's *History of Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age.*

[2] Rom. viii. 9; Heb. x. 1; Gal. iii. 24.

related as shadow and substance, symbol and thing symbolized, type and antitype?

Sixthly, on the supposition that the Christian atonement was the antitype of the Mosaic, the unexplained elements of the atoning ritual of the latter are readily explicable. It was seen in our examination of the Mosaic injunctions, that when all due allowance had been made for the essential, symbolic, and sacramental nature of those injunctions, there still remained many things to perplex and disturb in these professedly divine revelations. There was, for example, the cardinal difficulty of reconciling the giving of so materialistic a worship by Him, Whose nature must never be sensuously represented, and Whose most fitting designation was, "I AM." And in the matter of the sacrificial ritual, there was much that remained unsolved when all was said that the Law could say. When once the first principle had been fully grasped of life for life, of the life of a physically immaculate and selected animal for the life of man, an exquisite beauty of adaptation would be apparent in the details of presentation and slaughter, and a soothingly expressive consolation; but what light beyond the divine will had been unquestionably thrown upon the fundamental necessity for this extraordinary principle? With all its eloquence of symbol and potency of sacrament, it has again and again been seen during the course of the preceding book, that there were in the cycle of the Jewish ritual numerous features unexplained and discomposing, which, but for the tranquillizing effect of a belief, firm and immovable, in an unfolding providence that had not said its final word, might have been sufficient to shake the faith of the conscientious and rationally-minded to its very foundation. Now in Christ a key to these unexplained difficulties is afforded, and this is manifestly so in the matter of atonement. Atonement, as we have seen times and again, was effected under the Law by the presentation upon the appropriate altars of the blood of certain domestic animals; and, with all the light of the Old Testament revelations, there were questions with respect to the generic and specific selection of those animals, their slaughter and subsequent manipulation, which must have been sources of mental disquiet, if not of actual doubt, on the part of the

intelligent inquirer; it is these very questions which receive a satisfactory solution in the death of Christ. It is the death of Christ which first places in a clear light the peculiar selection of victims under the Law. Those victims consisted of oxen, sheep, goats, doves and pigeons; and if it be asked what principle or principles governed their selection, the reply is not easy so long as the eye is fixed upon the Law, and when the reply is made it is not very intelligible. All that the Law seemed to need was victims which were possessed of life, and which were genuine gifts, inasmuch as they were the products of the toil of the offerers. But had these been the only principles of selection, there was no reason why many another kind of beast or bird, which formed part of the offerer's property, might not be presented. It would appear that yet another principle guided the selection, the principle that eligible animal offerings should be chosen from those domestic creatures which stood in the most intimate relations with man. It was the sheep and the lambs, the bullocks and the calves, the goats and the kids, the pigeons and the doves of a pastoral people which were to be brought to the holy altars. Creatures which were at once genuine sacrifices of living things, and at the same time, according to the frequently cited and felicitous phrase of De Maistre, "the most human offerings," were alone, it would appear, legally available for sacrifice. And if Christ be the antitype of these victims, the reason is plain. A human offering would, of course, have been the most expressive symbol; but human sacrificing being interdicted by the exceptionally humane religious code of Mosaism, creatures possessed of life, human property, the product of man's vital energies, and the means by which those energies are recruited, the darlings of a people whose whole associations were with the shepherd life, were ordered to be offered in lieu of human sacrifices. Before the atonement of Christ, the selection of victims was in part unintelligible; after that atonement, the unintelligible was lucid as a pure spring. So, too, it was the sacrifice of Christ which first laid bare the purpose for the immaculate *physique* demanded of the victims presented at the altars. This immaculate *physique* symbolized, as in the case of the priesthood, the holiness of the substituted victim. How

pretentiously, as far as the animal was concerned! for its purity was simply physical, the accident of its birth, and completely disassociated from the results of volition. Yet in Him, Who knew no sin, the holy in life and the guileless in birth, the purpose of this pretentious symbol receives a solution, and a brilliancy of meaning is reflected where before there was accommodation and extreme mental allowance. And it is in the death of Christ alone that the Mosaic first principle of atonement by blood finds its rationale. To present the blood, to plead the forfeited life of a lamb, or an ox, or a goat, to say nothing of a pigeon, how could that avail before God? why should such a presentation be commanded and reiterated by the Jehovah of the Jew? Was it not the testimony of the deepest instincts of our nature, as well as of its most universally acquired habits, that the blood of bulls and of goats can never take away sin? What, then, was the significance of this first principle? Reasonable as were the subjective conditions of atonement, deserving as they were of the loudest and most solemn repetition, what was there but mysteriousness in the objective side, to the intelligently and seriously minded? But the whole thing is clear if it be acknowledged that the death of Christ, the penal and vicarious surrender of His sinless life, was the antitype towards which these earlier rites designedly pointed. If those rites were instituted not simply to impress the Jewish mind with the sense of the mercy and forgiveness that there is in God, but to familiarize the mind with those ideas of a valid sacrifice which were fulfilled in Christ, what is otherwise a gigantic difficulty has become level to the simplest comprehension. One may well wonder how the sprinkling of animal blood upon an altar could break the force of the sins man had committed before God. "The blood atones through the soul," it is said. Well and good; but how comes it that the soul of an animal can atone? Figuratively alone, it would appear, or, to speak more accurately, prospectively only. When Christ, however, presented the fact of His proffered life before the God of heaven, and an equivalent valid in law had been offered for the punishment due to sin, it could be readily understood why these initiatory types and shadows might be wisely permitted.

But all mere suggestions, valuable and well-nigh conclusive as they are, apart, the question is whether the atonement of Christ was the antitype of the Mosaic atonement; and this question resolves itself into another,—whether, assuming the pre-ordained connection between the Old and New Covenants, to which, as has been seen, the Scriptures bear abundant testimony, the atonement of Christ teaches by fact what the Mosaic atonement proclaimed merely by symbol. The reply must be in the affirmative.

There were four questions which were investigated in the chapter upon the "Sacramental Significance of the Mosaic Injunctions,"—viz. the nature of the Mosaic atonement, its method, its extent, and its efficacy. It was asked, what that atonement was in itself? how it was effected? whom it concerned? and was its effect permanent or transitory? Now, as regards the *nature* of the atonement, the definition need not vary; in the New Covenant, as in the Old, *to atone* is *to cover*, —so to enrobe the sinner that his sin no longer arouses the divine anger; and such a word as *atone*, or any of its derivatives, most amply expresses the effect of the work of Christ in the remission of sins; the consequences, too, of the atonement, under both dispensations, was the remission of sins contracted by nature or by intent. But a comparison of the answers returned by the Old and New Testaments to the remaining questions, conclusively shows that the atonement of Christ is the antitype foretold by type and prophecy.

Thus, it is unquestionable that the atonement of Christ is said in the New Testament to have been wrought without proviso; whereas the Mosaic atonement, efficacious as it was, was effected by a manifest and confessed accommodation. The Mosaic atonement was sacramental; the Christian worked by its native potency: to put the same thing in logical language, the former was an invariable antecedent, the latter was an efficient cause. This is manifest upon the slightest comparison; and after our detailed examination of the atoning work of Christ, and of the significance of the Mosaic offerings of blood, it is unnecessary to accumulate proofs. Time after time throughout the course of this inquiry, it has been seen how large a licence was demanded when the blood of bulls

and of goats was supposed to take away sin; time after time has it been remarked how great a claim was daily made upon the credence of the Jew: there is no inherent impossibility in what is ascribed to the blood of Christ. Granted the several postulates of the Gospel, that Christ is God; that He is Creator, Preserver, Lawgiver, and Judge; that He has decreed the punishment of sin by death; that, to restore His creation and uphold His law, He has Himself assumed a sinless humanity and submitted to the penalty of death; and shrink as we may from the idea of vicarious punishment, it cannot at any rate be declared impossible for such a scheme of salvation to effect what it pretends. But we have not to do with *à priori* possibilities and impossibilities. What we have to do with is the Scripture testimonies, and these plainly assert that the death of Christ achieved by inherent merit what the death of sacrificial victims sacramentally achieved.

Again, an argument for the antitypical nature of the atonement of Christ may be drawn from the extent of that atonement. None but Jews were permitted to offer sin-offerings, although foreigners were legally allowed to present burnt-offerings (which had a minute element of atonement attached to them). None but Jews were permitted to present offerings proper for sin or for trespass, or to participate in the great festal offerings when sin-offerings were presented, or have the smallest share in the solemn ceremonial of the Day of Atonement. One of the principal features, on the other hand, of the Christian faith, is that it recognises "neither Jew nor Greek, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond, free; but Christ is all and in all." What follows? Does not this,—that by the forbearance of God it was that the Jews, who had been specially chosen as the channels of His merciful revelations, had also been specially chosen to receive by sacramental rites, and not by a truly potent sacrifice for sin, the forgiveness of sins and the life of intercommunion? If the sin-offerings of the Jew were otherwise than sacramentally efficacious, must they not have been equally efficacious if presented by Gentiles? The very restrictions of the efficacy of the Mosaic sacrifices to a single nation is proof positive that in themselves those sacrifices possessed but a symbolic significance, that they

achieved by a divine accommodation what they were in themselves impotent to effect. The universality with which the Christian faith is ordered to be preached is thus a conclusive argument for the antitypical nature of that atonement which is that faith's corner-stone.

Further, there is the authority of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews for the argument in behalf of the antitypical nature of the death of Christ to be drawn from the fact that that death happened once for all; and the argument of that Epistle may be prudently quoted here in the place of any words of ours, inasmuch as it would be just as cogent by whomsoever or whensoever it was employed: "The law having a shadow of good things to come, not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices, which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect. For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins. But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance of sins again made every year. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. Wherefore, when (Jesus) cometh into the world, He saith, Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldest not, but a body hast Thou prepared me: . . . Lo, I come to do Thy will, O God. . . . By which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all."[1] The fact that the Mosaic sin-offerings called for frequent repetitions, whilst the sin-offering presented by Christ was offered once for all, infallibly points to the antitypical nature of the latter.

Such, then, is the scriptural argument respecting the relation between the sacrificial doctrines of Atonement under the Law and under the Gospel. The pouring out of the blood of Christ was not a figurative atonement merely, which some subtle and intangible analogy permitted to be so described; the death of Christ was not an atonement as discontent is a winter, or death is sleep's brother, or bells are music's laughter, or quietude is the crown of life, or riot is hundred-headed; the death of Christ was that true and unpretending atonement

[1] Heb. x. 1–10.

to which every previous atoning rite had pointed. It was the pre-Christian atonement that was figurative. And this must have been much more evident to those who had daily witnessed the Temple ritual running its accustomed round than to us. "There is such a deep-set, grandly real, and wide-reaching correspondence, that no man fresh in the sentiments of the altar could well miss it or fail to be strangely impressed by it. Here is the first-born, the unblemished beauty, the chaste Lamb of God; never came to mortal eyes any such perfect one before. And the expense He makes under His great love-struggle and heavy burden of feeling; His Gethsemane, where the burden presses Him down into agony; His Calvary, where, in His unprotesting and lamb-like submission, He allows Himself to be immolated by the world's wrath,—what will any one, seeing all this, so naturally and so inevitably call it as His sacrifice for the sins of the world? His blood, too, the blood of the incarnate Son of God, blood of the upper world half as truly as of this, when it touches and stains the defiled earth of this planet,—what so sacred blood on the horns of the altar and the lid of the mercy-seat did any devoutest worshipper at the altar ever see sprinkled for his cleansing! There his sin he hoped could be dissolved away, and it comforted his conscience that, by the offering of something sacred as blood, he could fitly own his defilement, and by such tender argument win the needed cleansing. But the blood of Christ,—He that was born of the Holy Ghost, He that was Immanuel,—when this sprinkles Calvary, it is to him as if some touch of cleansing were in it for the matter itself of the world. In short, there is so much in this analogy, and it is so affecting, so profoundly real, that no worshipper most devout, before the altar, having once seen Christ,—who He is what He has done by His cross, and the glorious offering He made of Himself in His ministry of good, faithful unto death,—who will not turn away instinctively to Him, saying: 'No more altars, goats, or lambs; these were shadows, I see; now has come the substance. This is my sacrifice, and here is my peace—the blood that was shed for the remission of sins; this I take and want no other.'"[1]

[1] Bushnell, *The Vicarious Sacrifice*, p. 405.

CHAPTER VII.

CHRISTIAN SACRIFICES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

"Der neue Bund ist nicht das Ende, sondern die Verklärung des Opfers."—HENGSTENBERG, *Die Opfer der heiligen Schrift*, p. 48.

ONE large portion of the New Testament doctrine of Sacrifice is now complete, that which is concerned with what we have frequently termed, in obedience to common usage, "the Sacrifice of Christ,"—in more precise language, "the Atoning Sacrifice of Christ." That work has been seen to be the surrender of His sinless self to death, that He might bear the penalty decreed upon the sins of the world. Into the speculative bearings or justification of this redemptive work of Christ we have not entered; it has been enough for us to obtain the scriptural testimony as to the special nature and effects of that work.

Before we pass on, however, to the remaining portion of the New Testament doctrine, we would say a word upon the terminology hitherto employed. It must have become abundantly evident that the death of Christ, manifestly sacrificial as it was,—connected, that is to say, with the sacrificial ritual of the Old Testament,—can only be broadly described as a sacrifice. It was only broadly that the death of Christ could be called a sin-offering, or a burnt-offering, or a trespass-offering; what the death of Christ actually was, was an *atonement*. Instead of being appropriately called by any single specific name selected from the list of sacrifices, the death of Christ answered to the whole atonement by blood which entered into almost every sacrifice of the Old Covenant. The death of Christ was the antitype of the pre-Christian atonement, whether Patriarchal or Mosaic. Not only, then, have we had

to do with one-half of the New Testament doctrine of Sacrifice, but, by reason of the inner connection of that death of Christ with the Mosaic injunctions, we have also disposed of one-half of the Old Testament doctrine. The study of the atonement of Christ has completed the study of the *atonement* as distinguished from the *presentation* of Mosaic sacrifice. To the counterpart of Mosaic presentation we now proceed.

In the brief analysis of the New Testament doctrine of Sacrifice given in the first chapter of this book, that doctrine was stated to consist of two sections, the New Testament doctrine of the Sacrifice of Christ, and the New Testament doctrine of the Sacrifice of Man. To the latter—a less commonly treated yet equally essential doctrine — we now advance. We shall, in the first place, substantiate by excerpts from the Scriptures the assertion that the lives and labours of Christian believers are described under sacrificial analogies; and in the second place, we shall collect the principal moments of the work so described,—these two points will occupy this chapter; then, following the method previously pursued, we shall demonstrate in the next chapter that the human sacrifices of the New Testament are the antitypes of those of the Old.

It is especially deserving of note that the apostles, who had passed their early life in the admiration and practice of the Jewish sacrificial system, employ the technicalities of that system to describe the life and duties of the Christian believer, as well as the work of Christ. Even James, the fragments of whose history and extant writings all point to his high appreciation of the Mosaic worship, says: "Pure *worship*[1] and unpolluted in the estimation of God our Father is this, To visit orphans and widows in their affliction, and to preserve oneself unspotted from the world;" and, exhorting the proud to "draw near to God," he adds, as if the rites of purification had no longer any place in his thoughts, "*purify* your hands, ye sinners; and make your hearts chaste, ye double-minded."[2] So Jude, in his splendid doxology, appeals

[1] Jas. i. 27: Θρησκία, *i.e.* "a form of divine worship."

[2] Jas. iv. 8: Καθαρίσατε χεῖρας, where καθαρίζω is the equivalent of *taher*, the Hebrew word for Mosaic *purifying*.

to Him Who is able to keep from falling, and to present before the presence of His glory as spotless sacrifices.[1] Peter designates the Christian disciples of the Asiatic churches "a spiritual house for a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ;"[2] and a little later, quotes the very words of the original covenant —"a royal priesthood"—to describe the relation of these believers to the God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ.[3] So also Peter speaks of the forgiveness of sins of which the Christian has become conscious as "a purification of his old sins,"[4] and of the holiness of the Christian to be desired at the last day as a being "without spot and blameless."[5] In the writings of Paul, these sacrificial designations of Christian discipleship are, as might be expected from their larger extent, yet more numerous. Thus, to quote a passage previously cited, Paul beseeches the Romans to "present their bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God;"[6] and in the same Epistle describes the Gentiles who had joined the Christian faith as "an acceptable offering."[7] So in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians he speaks of the Corinthians as "anointed" to the priesthood,[8] and as "a sweet savour" of the sacrifice of Christ,[9] and as the "temple of God."[10] The apostle calls the faith of the Philippians a "sacrifice and

[1] Jude 24: Ἀμώμους; *ἀμώμος* being the technical term for the spotless sacrificial victim. See LXX., Lev. xiv. 32, xv. 13, etc.

[2] 1 Pet. ii. 5: Οἶκος πνευματικός, εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον, ἀνενέγκαι πνευματικὰς θυσίας, etc. Compare the use of *οἶκος* in LXX., Ex. xxiii. 19, where it stands for the Hebrew *bayith*, as applied to the Tabernacle, and the use of *ἱεράτευμα* in Ex. xix. 6.

[3] 1 Pet. ii. 9: Ἱεράτευμα βασίλειον. Compare Ex. xix. 6.

[4] 2 Pet. i. 9: Τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν. Compare LXX., *e.g.* Lev. xiv. 32, xv. 13.

[5] 2 Pet. iii. 14: Ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι. Compare 1 Pet. i. 19, and note 1.

[6] Rom. xii. 1: Παραστῆσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν ἁγίαν τῷ Θεῷ εὐάρεστον. Compare on use of *θυσία*, Appendix I.

[7] Rom. xv. 16: Προσφορὰ εὐπρόσδεκτος. Compare, on *προσφορά*, Appendix I.

[8] 2 Cor. i. 21: Χρίσας; *χρίω* is the equivalent of *mashath*, "to anoint," "to consecrate to a sacred use," applied in LXX. to the priesthood, the Tabernacle, the altars.

[9] 2 Cor. ii. 15: Εὐωδία. See note 2 on next page.

[10] 1 Cor. iii. 16: Τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ. Compare the common LXX. phrase, *ὁ ναὸς κυρίου* *e.g.* 2 Chron. xviii. 16; Jer. vii. 3.

priestly ministration,"[1] and their monetary contributions "an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God."[2] To Titus, Paul speaks of Christian disciples under the express language of the ancient covenant as a "peculiar people,"[3] and he counsels Timothy as to a "purified heart and conscience."[4] The Apostle John has also something to say in his brief Epistle about the "anointing" of Christians to their sacred duties, and tells in the Revelation of an "altar," "a temple," a "lamb," "blood," and "priests." The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews admonishes his hearers to "offer thank-offerings to God—that is, the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to His name," and "to do good and impart," for with such sacrifices God is well pleased.[5]

Now, in the consideration of these apostolic descriptions of the life and labours of the Christian believer under sacrificial analogies, it will greatly conduce to accuracy and sharpness of conception, if the method already pursued with respect to the parallel descriptions of the work of Christ be rigidly followed, and we ascertain, first, the apostolic doctrines of the state of man under the Gospel in their diversity, and, secondly, the New Testament doctrine in its completeness. And the examination of the testimonies of the several apostles will become the more conclusive if the preceding order of examination be reversed. To show most strikingly that the work of Christ was described by the apostles under language borrowed from the Old Testament worship, it was necessary to show that such language was employed by those apostles whose antagonism to Judaism was the most pronounced, as well as by those who looked with evident fondness upon their ancient faith. To show most strikingly that the objective side of the Judaic sacrificial worship fell into complete disregard with Christian teachers, it is advisable to show that such

[1] Phil. ii. 17: *Θυσία καὶ λειτουργία*; *λειτουργία* is the Greek equivalent for *abhodah*. See LXX., Ex. xxxviii. 21; Num. iv. 25, etc.

[2] Phil. iv. 18: *Ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας, θυσίαν δεκτὴν, εὐάρεστον τῷ Θεῷ*. Compare LXX., Gen. viii. 21; Ex. xxix. 18; Lev. i. 9, 13, 17, etc.

[3] Tit. ii. 14: *Λαὸν περιούσιον*. Compare Ex. xix. 5.

[4] 1 Tim. i. 3, iii. 9; 2 Tim. i. 3, ii. 28: *Καρδία, συνειδήσις, καθαρά*. On use of *καθαρά*, see p. 439, note 2.

[5] Heb. xiii. 15, 16: *Θυσίαν αἰνέσεως*. Compare LXX., Lev. vii. 3, 5.

neglect is as conspicuous in those who were friendly as in those who were antagonistic to the earlier faith.

It followed from the general teaching of our Lord Himself concerning His relation to the Old Testament dispensation, that He should regard the relation of man to God effected by Himself as a novel one, at once ratifying and superseding the Old Testament dispensation and its statutes. He who declared His blood to be that of the New Testament, also declared, as Jeremiah had further prophesied, that iniquity would now be forgiven, and the law written on the inward parts. His death, He said, should witness the rending asunder of the Temple veil, and the subversion of the ancient sacrificial worship.[1] If the terms of the cultus instituted in the wilderness were to be still applied to human acts, those terms must bear a different sense. The mediation of a priesthood was at an end; Jesus announced Himself as the Way to the Father by Whom all should approach; and to the significant words, "Every one which seeth the Son and believeth on Him may have everlasting life," the yet more significant words were added, "Him that cometh" (whether priest or common Israelite or Gentile) "I will in no wise cast out."[2] So also the days of material sacrifices are no more; the sole conditions of introduction into the kingdom of heaven are, faith in Himself and an unreserved surrender to Himself. Those words of our Lord to the woman of Samaria are, in fact, a summary of the new relations introduced by Him between man and his Maker: "Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. . . . The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship Him. God is a Spirit: and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth."[3]

The Apostle John, as his Epistle and the Book of the Revelation testify, comes nearest to the teaching of Jesus upon the changed conditions of human approach to the Deity. Faith in Jesus is the one prerequisite to a life in

[1] Matt. xxiv. 1, etc.; Mark xiii. 1, etc.; Luke xxi. 5, 6, 20.
[2] John vi. 37, 40.
[3] John iv. 21–24.

Christ, which is in reality a life in God,[1] and a life that is eternal.[2] Those who have faith in Christ are conscious of a cleansing of their inmost selves by the blood of Jesus,[3] and, in spite of frequent lapses into sin which they cannot but confess, are nevertheless conscious of the forgiveness of their sins;[4] they are born of God;[5] they are sons of God;[6] their faith blossoms into love,[7] obedience,[8] righteousness,[9] self-abnegation.[10] Nothing whatever is said by John respecting the so-called ceremonial injunctions of the law, and most assuredly no exhortation is uttered concerning the duty of the observance of those injunctions; indeed it is evident that, in the conception of John, "old things had passed away, all things had become new." The Jew or the Gentile who had been previously banished to the courts of the Temple could now approach the Holiest itself by the blood of Jesus; and the life of the believer was a life of loving fellowship with the Father and the Son, in which the truest acts of worship were the labours and patience of a life of self-sacrifice in the service of God and man.

The same features of the proximity of God to the Christian believer, and the abolition of the Mosaic restrictions, together with the possibility of a life of self-surrender and the abrogation of the materialistic rites of Judaism, are yet more conspicuous in the teaching of Paul. None will question that faith in the atonement wrought by Christ[11] becomes, with Paul, the starting-point of the Christian life. This faith produces the sense of justification,[12] the assurance of adoption,[13] and the progressive change of sanctification.[14] Through faith Christ dwells in our hearts,[15] and we receive a quickening of our mortal bodies,[16] the earnest of eternal life.[17] The life of faith is the life of a new creature,[18] a death to sin and a life to God,[19] a yielding unto God as those who are alive from

[1] 1 John iii. 23, v. 4, 5. [2] 1 John ii. 25, v. 11, 13. [3] 1 John i. 7, 9, ii. 1, 2.
[4] 1 John ii. 12, iii. 5. [5] 1 John iii. 9. [6] 1 John iii. 1.
[7] 1 John ii. 9, 10. [8] 1 John ii. 2, iii. 22, v. 2. [9] 1 John iii. 11.
[10] 1 John iii. 16, 17. [11] Rom. iii. 22, 25, iv. 16, 24; Gal. ii. 16, iii. 22.
[12] Rom. iii. 28, iv. 1; Gal. ii. 17. [13] Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iii. 26.
[14] 1 Thess. iv. 3, v. 23. [15] Gal. ii. 20; Eph. i. 10, iii. 17.
[16] Rom. viii. 11; Eph. ii. 1. [17] Rom. v. 21, vi. 22, 23.
[18] 2 Cor. v. 17. [19] Rom. vi. 11; Col. iii. 43; 2 Cor. ii. 16.

the dead.[1] This life of faith is also a life of hope,[2] and a life of charity.[3] In fact, faith having come, the whole aspect of life, whether on the Godward or manward side, is metamorphosed; for Godwards, the life is a life of sonship,[4] obedience,[5] and righteousness;[6] and manwards a life of philanthropy and good works,[7] prayer,[8] the giving of thanks,[9] stedfastness in daily calling,[10] the due use of gifts,[11] are forms of divine service: repression of the flesh,[12] the earnest running of life's race,[13] the patient endurance of suffering,[14] are fields of sacrifice. According to Paul, every believer in Christ has received the priestly privilege of being made nigh unto God,[15] and in his priestly vocation needs offer no incense but prayer, no peace-offering but thanksgiving, no sacrifice of atonement but the blood of Christ, no bloodless sacrifice but the deeds of a life of faith, utterance, knowledge, and liberality. The true circumcision are those "who worship God in the spirit and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and place no reliance upon the material."[16] Indeed, as a contrast to the exhortations of Moses to the Israelites, nothing can be more instructive, by way of placing in a strong light the altered relations of New Testament times, than the Pauline exhortations. If Paul writes to the Ephesians, the burden of his appeal is, that "they walk worthy of the vocation with which they are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love; endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," fighting, praying, watching.[17] "Whatsoever ye do in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus,"[18] is his advice to the Colossians. To the Philippians he writes: "Rejoice in the Lord alway: and again I say, Rejoice. Let your moderation be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand. Be careful for nothing; but in everything by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving, let your re-

[1] Rom. vi. 13.
[2] 1 Cor. xiii. 13; Rom. viii. 24.
[3] 1 Cor. x. 3; Gal. v. 6; Col. iii. 14.
[4] Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iii. 26.
[5] Rom. vi. 16, xvi. 16; 2 Cor. x. 5, 6; Heb. v. 9.
[6] Phil. iii. 9.
[7] 1 Cor. x. 3; Eph. ii. 10.
[8] Phil. iv. 6; 1 Tim. ii. 2.
[9] 1 Thess. v. 18.
[10] 1 Cor. vii. 18–24.
[11] 1 Cor. xii.
[12] 1 Cor. vi. 15; Col. iii. 5.
[13] 1 Cor. ix. 24, 25.
[14] Phil. i. 29.
[15] Eph. ii. 13, 18; comp. Heb. iv. 6, x. 19.
[16] Phil. iii. 3.
[17] Eph. iv. 1–4, vi. 14–19.
[18] Col. iii. 17.

quests be made known unto God. And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus."[1] To Titus he says: "The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and fleshly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, Who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works."[2] Or, recapitulating his masterly summary of Christian ethics which he has appended to that unparalleled compendium of Christian doctrine, the Epistle to the Romans, what a changed world greets us in the very opening verse,[3] with its description of "living sacrifices"!—a world which becomes yet more strongly emphasized when it is seen that these "living sacrifices" are lives of unreserved surrender to God, characterised by nonconformity to the world, sobriety of self-esteem, due employment of gifts, appropriate social, commercial, and religious conduct, patience, prayer, charitable dispositions, hospitality, a forgiving spirit, honesty, sympathy, due subjection to political authorities,—in short, a putting on of the Lord Jesus.

Further, not only do we find a relinquishment of the distinctive elements of the Jewish ritual of atonement by animal blood, and of worship by presentation in kind, on the part of those apostles who are manifestly at the greatest remove from conceptions essentially Mosaic, such as Paul and John, but the same relinquishment is equally conspicuous on the parts of Peter, James, and Jude, whose evident concern it was to make the transition to the new *régime* as gentle as possible. Paul, in the energy of his mission to the Gentiles, seemed to care little for the contrast between circumcision and uncircumcision; Peter, in firm adherence to his Master's command that the gospel should be first preached at Jerusalem, was scrupulously careful not to offend national susceptibilities by a protrusion of minor points of difference; and yet in Peter and Paul alike we see the advocacy of a different mode of worship,

[1] Phil. iv. 5–8. [2] Tit. ii. 11–15. [3] Rom. xii., etc.

and the proclamation of a changed relation between man and God.

In the First Epistle of Peter the same elements of the earthly life of the Christian are visible, as have already been seen in the words of Jesus, as well as of Paul and John. Faith in Jesus is the foundation-stone of a living temple, a spiritual house; believers in Christ are its priests, the sacrifices they offer are spiritual sacrifices.[1] Believers in Christ are, indeed, what the Jewish people aspired to be, "a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people;" and they show forth, as their predecessors in the election of God never could, the praises of Him who called them out of darkness, as from a second Egypt, into His marvellous light.[2] If it be asked how these praises are displayed, the natural inference from the remainder of Peter's Epistle is by self-surrender to the will of God in all the relations of life, by obedience to the divine commands in the inner and outer world, in the circle of home, in the realm of society, in the sphere of religion. The methods of worship recognised by Peter are spiritual sacrifices,[3] prayer,[4] and watchfulness.[5] So far also from any Mosaic restrictions being placed upon the approach to God, Jesus is the only High Priest,[6] and all His disciples enjoy the priestly right of divine access.[7]

The Epistle of James also contributes its element of proof to the astonishing contrast between the position of the believer under the Law and under the Gospel. Here, again, it is evident that faith in Jesus[8] has introduced the believer into new relations with his Maker. The ceremonial of Mosaism is no longer binding; its ethical precepts are the main concern. That love[9] and good works[10] are produced in his life, is to be the Christian's main concern. It is heavenly wisdom to be pure, peaceable, gentle, persuasible, merciful and fertile in goodness, open-handed and open-hearted.[11] Indeed, no more striking testimonies can be adduced of the changed face of religion, than that James, himself a Jew, with Jewish leanings even in his Christian profession, addressing Jews, should utter

[1] 1 Pet. ii. 5–7. [2] 1 Pet. ii. 9. [3] 1 Pet. ii. 5. [4] 1 Pet. iv. 7.
[5] 1 Pet. iv. 7. [6] 1 Pet. ii. 5. [7] 1 Pet. ii. 9. [8] Jas. ii. 1, 24.
[9] Jas. ii. 8. [10] Jas. ii. 14, etc. [11] Jas. iii. 17.

such sentiments as these: "Draw nigh to God, and He will draw nigh to you;"[1] "Is any among you afflicted? *let him pray;* Is any merry? *let him sing psalms;* Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church, and *let them pray over him;*"[2] "Confess your faults one to another;"[3] "The effectual fervent *prayer* of a righteous man availeth much;"[4] "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world."[5]

And, finally, a similar conception of the earthly life of the Christian man is deducible from the brief Epistle of Jude. Faith is still the one foundation.[6] "Faith certainly appears here in its objective signification; but the Word of God, once delivered to the saints, is to be vitally believed,[7] so that the edifice of spiritual life is to be built thereon,[8]—faith thus appearing a subjective condition of salvation. Added to this, the denial of the Lord Jesus Christ forms the direct opposite to the state of a true Christian;[9] and in every stage of the divine economy of grace, in the Old Covenant as in the New, unbelief[10] was the object of God's displeasure and judgment."[11] Christian life is to be "a building up of yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost," and keeping "yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life."[12] Jude also implies that the Christian believer is the true priest,[13] Christ the one High Priest,[14] and the true sacrifice a life of growth in the holy faith of Jesus.[15]

Thus, then, by an examination of the words of Jesus and His apostles, it has become evident that, under all varieties of speech and argument, there was a complete unanimity with respect to the changed relations of the ordinary Christian believer as contrasted with the Jewish layman. According to the unanimous teaching of the New Testament, the earthly life of the disciple of Jesus was very different to that of the

[1] Jas. iv. 8. [2] Jas. v. 13, 14. [3] Jas. v. 16. [4] Jas. v. 16.
[5] Jas. i. 27. [6] Jude, ver. 20. [7] Jude, ver. 3. [8] Jude, ver. 20.
[9] Jude, ver. 4. [10] Jude, ver. 5.
[11] Schmidt, *Biblische Theologie des N. T.* (translated in *Foreign Theological Library*, p. 370).
[12] Jude, vv. 20, 21. [13] Jude, ver. 24. [14] Jude, ver. 24. [15] Jude, ver. 20.

disciple of Moses; the relation to God was different in each case; the method of divine worship was different; there was a conspicuous difference in the feature of mediation; and lastly, although by no means least, there was a permanence, there was an adaptation, and there was an universality in the Christian relations which rendered Christianity in those respects wholly foreign to Judaism. For the sake of clearness, it will be desirable to place in more orderly and succinct sequence the leading features in which, as regards the earthly life of the Christian, we have seen the apostles and their Master to have been completely agreed.

In the first place, then, it is the unquestionable teaching of the New Testament, that faith in the atonement of Jesus is the invariable origin and the unintermittent accompaniment of the Christian life.

Secondly, by virtue of that faith in the atonement of Jesus, the Christian believer is enabled to approach the Most High without any mediator but Jesus; in other words, to repeat the sentiment of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, by virtue of "the blood of Christ" the brotherhood in Christ may boldly enter even the Holiest where God dwells.

Thirdly, this privilege of approach to God by means of the atonement and intercession of Jesus, is circumscribed by no ritual restrictions, but is available at any time and at any place.

Fourthly, the Christian method of worship (with one exception, which we reserve for the present) is by prayer, thanksgiving, and self-surrender, without any further admixture of symbolism than these things imply.

And, lastly, self-surrender being a form of divine service, it is possible to worship God by an obedient and faithful discharge of all the manifold duties of life, personal, social, civil, and religious.

CHAPTER VIII.

CHRISTIAN SACRIFICES UNDER THE NEW AND OLD COVENANTS.

"Οτι μὲν οὖν αἱ εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαριστίαι, ὑπὸ τῶν ἀξίων γινόμεναι, τέλειαι μόναι καὶ εὐάρεστοί εἰσι τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαι, καὶ αὐτὸς φημι. — JUSTIN MARTYR, *Dialogus c. Tryphone*, cap. cxvii.

THE vast change effected in the relation of man to his Maker by the atonement of Christ may be illustrated by a comparison of the teaching of the prophets, the flower of the Old Covenant, and the Apostles, the flower of the New. In both there is the same emphatic declaration of the moral side of all true religion. If Isaiah writes so vividly: "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto Me? saith the Lord: I am full of the burnt-offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of calves, or of lambs, or of he-goats. . . . Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before Mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well;" just as vividly, and a trifle more incisively, James writes: "A man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works: show me thy faith without thy works, and I will show thee my faith by my works. Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believe, and tremble. But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?" Nevertheless, in spite of their unanimity upon the practical aspects of true religion, the prophets present considerable contrasts to the apostles in the consciousness of their personal relation to God, and in their teaching as to the relation attainable by man. With the prophet the symbolic ritual of the Mosaic worship is the medium of divine approach; with the apostle, it is prayer and thanksgiving and work that conduct into the divine presence. A prophet may have a vision in the Temple of the Lord of Hosts, and an audience of

angels as they sing their Trisagion, but he cries astonied, "Woe is me;" such visions too were occasional, if not rare: the apostles proclaim to all the possibility of approach at any time to the Holiest, if certain conditions be fulfilled. The prophets exultingly proclaim an atonement to be effected, and a Prince by whom peace shall be vouchsafed to the human conscience; the apostles glory in an atonement accomplished once for all, in a Prince Who has assumed His crown, and Whose reign of peace shall know no end. Faith in God for what He will perform is the undertone of prophecy; faith in God for what He has performed is the undertone of the apostolic testimony. Or, to place the contrast yet more strikingly, read side by side the Prophecy of Malachi and the Epistle to the Galatians; prophet and apostle are lamenting a lapsed religion, but in how different a manner! prophet and apostle are proclaiming a method of reformation, but of how different a kind!

Still, the readiness with which the relations between the Christian believer and his God may be described under the language of the sacrificial observances of Mosaism, a single glance renders apparent. How vividly, for example, the characteristics of the Christian life are depicted to him who is familiar with the rites of the Tabernacle and Temple! As he reads, the Christian is a priest, his body is a temple, his life is a sacrifice; the varied acts of worship of a transformed burnt-offering, a transformed peace-offering, a transformed sin-offering, even of a transformed paschal feast, may be his special privileges since Christ has died. In the manifold analogies, indeed, between the worship of the Old Testament and that of the New, there is scarcely a single feature of the Mosaic cultus, varied as it was, which might not be appropriately and tellingly employed in Christian preaching or teaching as a figurative representation of Christian privileges and duties. But we do not delay to exemplify this possibility of the figurative employment of the ancient rites at greater length; any reader of Christian books, or hearer of Christian exposition, is familiar with these figurative applications of the Mosaic injunctions; it is with the more precise and scientific employment of these rites we are more directly concerned.

It is in the activities and passivities of the Christian life that the true antitypes are to be found of the numerous details of the Mosaic injunctions, other than those concerning the method of atonement, the high-priesthood, and the Tabernacle. Just as the atonement by blood has its antitype in the atonement made by the death of Jesus; just as the high-priesthood of Aaron and his successors has its antitype in the heavenly intercession and mediation of Jesus; just as the Holy Place and the Holiest have their antitypes in the Christian Church and the Heavenly World, so the remaining elements of the Mosaic ritual (and *à fortiori* of the ritual of the Patriarchs) —viz., the rites of purification and sacrifice, and the duties and amenities of the priesthood—have their antitypes in certain aspects and functions of the earthly life of the Christian believer. And we say *aspects* and *functions* advisedly; for although, loosely considered it is true, the Christian might be regarded as the antitype of many observances, yet, if accuracy be desired, it is not in the Christian life most generally considered, but in certain aspects and functions of that life, that the antitypes in question are found. The ceremonial law, in fact, wisely interpreted, may become as valuable a guide and monitor in the conduct of the religious life of the Christian as is the moral law, to adopt the commonly recognised distinctions, in the conduct of the Christian's moral life. This point, so important in the study of the connection between the Old and New Testaments, may be judiciously illustrated at greater length. It is part of a wider question. It has been a commonly expressed opinion among typologists, that there may be but one antitype to a variety of types; thus Epiphanius, in a frequently quoted passage, described Christ as an offering, a sin-offering, a priest, an altar, a high priest, a sheep, a lamb, all in all in fact. That this opinion rested upon a confused apprehension of the nature of type and antitype, has been already seen in the examination of the figurative application of sacrificial language to the life and work of Christ. Figuratively, the death of Christ may be called a burnt-offering, a peace-offering, a sin-offering, a trespass-offering, a meat-offering, or a drink-offering, any analogy, near or remote, sufficing in justification of a merely figurative usage; antitypically regarded,

however, the death of Christ was seen to have had but one type in all the round of ancient sacrificial observance, that type entering, it is true, into every section of that observance—the element of atonement by animal blood. It is only by poetic licence that Christ may be called a peace-offering or a sin-offering; and nothing but confusion thrice confounded can result from attaching to such phrases anything but a figurative sense. Such figurative usage has undoubtedly its value in calling attention to the foundation of the analogy which renders the figure in any degree appropriate: the error is in supposing a figure of speech to possess an argumentative force. That Christ should be the antitypical high priest is perfectly intelligible and true, inasmuch as in Christ and in the Aaronic priest there is the same essential significance, expressed symbolically in the latter case, and without the medium of symbol in the former; for a similar reason, that Christ by the exceptional potency of His death upon the cross should be the antitypical atonement, is also true as well as intelligible; but to say that Christ was the antitypical sin-offering or peace-offering, is to launch into a wild and harbourless sea of conflicting opinions, and to commit oneself to such conclusions as that, inasmuch as the offerer himself slew the victim he presented, Christ slew Himself, and that, inasmuch as the offerer shared in the sacrificial feast, Christ partook of His own offering to cement His relations with the Father. The fact is, that confusion is only avoided by remembering that the thing represented may have many figurative synonyms, but the thing typified has but one type. It is in the several aspects of Christ's life that there seems a plausible reason for assuming that there may be but one antitype to a series of types; but if these aspects be distinctly brought into view, it will be found that there is no valid reason to doubt that in the pre-ordained revelations of God there is but one antitype for each type. Thus, should it appear that Christ is at once the antitypical atonement and the antitypical high priest, further reflection shows that it is the blood of Christ—the life poured out on Calvary—that is the atonement, and the pleading and presenting that blood before the Father which constitutes the priesthood of Jesus. A parallel confusion has also been largely

introduced into the investigation of type and antitype in the sacrifices presented by man under the two Covenants; it is in the characteristic aspects and functions of the Christian life, not in that life in its generality, that antitypes are to be found of the characteristic religious acts of the life of the Jew.

The intricacies of the more precise and scientific employment of the ancient rites in their connection with the Christian dispensation, will display a beautiful contrivance and an exquisite adaptation, if but a single principle be carried in the hand as a clue to the labyrinth. That principle is, that it is in what we have termed the "Essential Significance" of the several Mosaic rites we are to look for that pre-ordained connection with something not as yet revealed which constitutes a type. It is the dogmatic statements of the Mosaic dispensation which receive elucidation from the dispensation introduced by Jesus, and it is therefore in those dogmatic statements that the key is found to the mazes of Typology. Let the essential significance of the Mosaic injunctions be firmly and accurately grasped, and Typology, as far as regards that branch which concerns our subject, speedily yields up its treasures; let the essential significance be ignored or loosely apprehended, and Typology passes into a contemptible allegorizing. And this is no mere empirical principle; this principle is a consequence of the pre-ordained fact of development in revelation. Had the truth as it is in Jesus been fully revealed in Eden, types and antitypes would have had no place. It was not so. The ultimate truths of the Christian faith were to be imparted after a passage through lower stages, after a presentation of the same truths in more material forms; hence types and antitypes. Thus it was the will of God that it should be revealed to man in due time, that by virtue of the mediation and atonement of Jesus he might be restored to the primitive bliss and religious privileges of Paradise; now, unless man was to be debarred from sharing in those blood-bought blessings until the death of Christ had actually taken place in history, that great truth of atonement must be revealed in symbol, a divine interpretation of the symbol being at the same time imparted. If, then, in after times, it is our desire to trace the progress of the divine plan of revelation, it must be by the

comparison of these divine interpretations with the truths of the Christian system. In finding, for example, the pre-ordained connection between the sacrifices of the New and Old Covenants, it is the essential significance of the pre-Christian sacrifices which supplies us with the necessary point of departure.

The Christian is the antitype of the Jewish priest. What in the Aaronite appeared in symbol, appears in the Christian without any admixture of symbol. It is the Christian who possesses pre-eminently the four attributes which make up the biblical conception of a priest; for, "called" as he is "in Christ Jesus," according to the common apostolic phrase, the Christian displays his evident divine election; in his unreserved surrender, which has not even shrunk from leaving all that he may follow Jesus, there is a genuine and unvarnished acceptance of the divine call; not only is he "called," but he is "called to be a saint," and thus, by the very prerogative of his vocation, he possesses the attribute of righteousness; whilst, if the Jewish priest gloried in his exceptional privilege of divine approach, what words can convey the superior nature of the Christian's right of access! The Christian enjoys in fact what the Aaronite enjoyed in figure; hence he is the antitypical priest. And the same truth is equally conspicuous when the priestly functions are regarded. It was the duty of the priest to present symbolic sacrifices of atonement and worship; it is the Christian's function to plead before God the one sacrifice of atonement, and to present offerings of more real worship. To the Jewish priest it was allowed to enter the Holy Place and worship the Most High, secret behind the veil, with incense and bread and oil, these things becoming by the divine mercy sacraments of divinely answered prayer, divinely accorded sustenance, and divinely imparted light; so into a nobler holy place the Christian is permitted to enter, where, hidden as God still is behind the veil, and invisible by those who are yet in the flesh, the Almighty is far more truly near and approachable; so the Christian may present before God his spiritualized offerings of prayer and bread and oil, which become to him, also by the mercy of God, sacraments of holiest blessing. Whatever

privilege the Jewish priest enjoyed, whatever characteristic he possessed, those privileges and characteristics every Christian has in less material form, and therefore in fuller measure.

Leaving it to our readers to expand and apply the thought that the pleading before God in prayer, at the various crises of life, the merits of Jesus for the remission of original sin in its numerous manifestations is the antitype of the several rites of cleansing, we pass on to the comparison of the several sacrifices presented under the two dispensations.

Let the general ritual of Old Testament sacrifice be primarily examined. Again, we repeat, this ritual will beautifully illustrate the relation between human sacrifices under the New and Old Covenants if two things be borne in mind,—viz., the fact that the antitype of that atonement which was wrought by blood has been found in the atonement by the blood of Jesus; and, secondly, the essential significance of the sacrifices generically and specifically considered.

The common symbolic elements of the Mosaic sacrifices, as has been abundantly seen in the earlier part of this work, were the *presentation*, the *imposition of the hand*, the *manipulation with the blood*, the *cremation*, and the *sacrificial feasting*. Each of these symbols finds its antitype in the sacrifices of the Christian life. In the solemn presentation of a victim at the altar, the offerer expressed his desire to approach the Majesty on High in the appointed way; is it not the same desire which every Christian expresses, when, relying on the work of Jesus, he approaches God in any eligible form of the multiform Christian worship, but without the medium of symbol? The Jewish worshipper laid his hand upon his sacrifice to identify it with himself, to signalize that offering as peculiarly his own; is not that symbolic act exquisitely superseded as well as unsymbolically expressed, when the Christian believer deliberately consecrates himself, or his substance, or his activity, according to the form his self-sacrifice assumes, unreservedly to the divine service? The blood manipulation blended the element of atonement with every ancient sacrifice of whatever kind; is not the antitype of that imposing rite to be found in that faith in the death of Jesus which intermingles in every act of Christian service?

How the divine acceptance, too, which was signified by the sublimation by the holy fire, fades away into nothingness as compared with the acceptance of every gift of which the Christian is conscious! And as for the sacrificial feast, by which the Father assures His son of the privilege of communion, what is that in comparison with the intercourse, non-figurative and spiritually engrossing, which is vouchsafed to him who, experiencing the sense of the divine adoption, gives now himself and now some fruit of his labour to his God? Verily, with respect to the possibilities and amenities of service, as well as the nature of the atonement, the Law was but a shadow of the good things to come.

Every deliberate recourse to God in which the Christian pleads the blood of Jesus for his sin, is an antitypical sin-offering. That recourse, as was the case in the public and private offerings enjoined by Moses, may have been prompted by some special sin, or by that overwhelming sense of general sinfulness which the knowledge of God evokes; but, in either case, the pleading at the footstool of the Almighty the one potent atonement, is the offering to God without symbol what the Jew symbolically presented in his sin-offering. "If any man sin," wrote the Apostle John, "we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and He is the atonement for our sins."[1] It is the prayer of faith which urges this atonement to the very face of the Almighty. That request that the "heart" may be "sprinkled from an evil conscience" is the genuine sin-offering to which the ancient typical offering pointed.

The reparations by every repentant Zacchæus for wrongs done are the antitypical trespass-offerings. Conscience-money for frauds in human and divine things, when presented by the Christian in recognition of the death of Jesus, is the true *asham*. And it is worthy of remark that, if the Old Testament asserted by its typical offerings that even restitution to man was ineffectual unless an atonement was made before God by blood, the New Testament no less clearly asserts that the atonement of Christ will not suffice to obtain forgiveness for wrongs done, unless the pleading of that atonement be accompanied by appropriate restitution. But we pass on.

[1] 1 John ii. 1, 2.

Any act of self-surrender, whether mental or material, is an antitypical burnt-offering. What the Jew expressed by figure when he brought his bullocks, his sheep, his kids, or his doves, the Christian expresses by facts when he presents before God in self-sacrifice his vows of allegiance, his deeds of self-abnegation, his substance, his energies, his thoughts, his desires. Yet not even these are acceptable without a remembrance of the blood of Jesus; but if to their presentation before God there is superadded a belief in Jesus' finished work, if, therefore, both gifts and atonement are laid at the throne of the Heavenly Majesty, then the true burnt-offering has been brought which God will follow with His gracious acceptance.

And not to delay longer upon what has received sufficient illustration, any offering of self or substance by the believer in Jesus, which is intended to arouse or cement communion with the Father of Spirits, is the antitypical peace-offering. The prayer of faith, the intercommunion of spirit, the act of self-denial which the offerer presents in testimony of his desire for divine fellowship, any feeling or desire or act which is believingly laid before God with a request that He would manifest Himself, these things are the realities, without any intervention of pre-Christian symbolism, for which those shadows of the ancient festal offerings prepared the way. It may be left to the reader to supply the Christian antitypes to the tithes and first-fruits and meat-offerings and drink-offerings,—to all the various injunctions of the sacrificial law which have not been individually passed under review.

The five points, then, in which, at the close of the previous chapter, the New Testament doctrine of the Sacrifices possible to man was summarized, may be precisely expressed in the terminology of Mosaism. Translated into sacrificial language, those points are:—

First, By virtue of the atonement of Jesus, itself antitypical of the ancient atonement by animal blood, antitypical sacrifices may be offered by the Christian believer.

Secondly, By virtue of the atonement of Jesus, and that present pleading of the atonement before God which constitutes the antitypical high-priesthood, the Christian believer has been admitted to the office of the antitypical priest.

Thirdly, The office of priesthood to which the believer is admitted is circumscribed by no ritual restrictions, but is available at any time and in any place.

Fourthly, The priestly service of the Christian (with one exception, for the present reserved) is the presentation before God of such antitypical sacrifices as prayer and thanksgiving and acts of self-surrender.

Fifthly, Self-surrender being a form of priestly service, it is possible to discharge the priestly office by an obedient and faithful presentation before God of all the manifold duties of life—personal, social, civil, and religious.

CHAPTER IX.

THE SACRIFICE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

"Ecclesiæ oblatio, quam Dominus docuit offerri in universo mundo, purum sacrificium reputatum est apud Deum, et acceptum est ei."—IRENÆUS, *Contra Hæreses*, Lib. IV. cap. xviii.

BY the judicious introduction, in the former part of this treatise, of a well-known theological technicality, we were enabled to convey a difficult truth with exactness; by applying the name "sacrament" to the Mosaic sacrifices, their precise use in the pre-Christian economy was simply and clearly indicated. Nor in the use of this word was there attached to it any new or unusual meaning. A sacrament was defined to be *a means of grace*, an instrument in the hands of the divine mercy for effecting that which no instrument could effect by its inherent power—a material channel for a spiritual blessing. Just as, in the Christian dispensation, the foolishness of preaching becomes by the concurrence of the Spirit the agent of conversion and edification, so the Jewish sacrifices wrought, by the divine co-operation with human adoring acts, spiritual results beyond their highest capacity. And, we repeat, in thus laying the word *sacrament* under contribution, we are but using a term perfectly intelligible to by far the larger part of Christendom, perfectly intelligible at any rate to the Greek and Romish Churches, to the Lutheran Church, and to the Reformed Churches, whether of Scotland, Switzerland, Holland, or England, as is proved by their recognised Confessions of Faith. Thus the Greek Church teaches: "The sacrament is a material and visible rite, which carries into the soul of the believer the invisible grace of God."[1] In the *Roman Catechism*, which expands at some

[1] Ὀρθόδοξος Ὁμολογία τῆς Καθολικῆς καὶ Ἀποστολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς, reprinted in Kimmel, *Libri Symbolici Ecclesiæ Orientalis*, 1843.

length the brief statement of the Tridentine decree, *de Sacramentis*, that sacraments are those things "by which all true righteousness has its commencement, or when begun is increased, or when lost is restored,"[1] it is written: "To expound at greater length what a sacrament is, it must be taught that it is something submitted to the senses, which has by divine institution the power of symbolizing and effecting holiness and righteousness."[2] The Augsburg Confession, the established Confession of the Lutheran Church, asserts: "By the agency of the word and the sacraments, the Holy Spirit is imparted *by instruments, so to speak*, Who accomplishes faith, where and when it seems good to God, in those who hear the gospel."[3] A similar definition is given by the Westminster Confession, but in somewhat more figurative and less precise language: "Sacraments are holy signs and seals of the covenant of grace, immediately instituted by God, to represent Christ and His benefits, and to confirm our interest in Him. . . . There is in every sacrament a spiritual relation, or sacramental union, between the sign and the thing signified, whence it comes to pass that the names and effects of the one are attributed to the other."[4] To these testimonies may be added that of the *Thirty-nine Articles:* "Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace and God's goodwill towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him."[5]

Now this same technical designation will enable us to briefly and precisely describe an aspect of the New Testament doctrine of Sacrifice which has scarcely been touched upon hitherto, viz. the relation of those sacrifices to their spiritual effects. In our study of the New Testament doctrine of the Atoning Work of Christ, we saw that amongst the effects wrought by the death of Christ was the restoration of the Christian believer to the Father's friendship, as well as the

[1] *Canones et Decreta Concilii Tridentini*, Sessio Septima, Decret. de Sacramentis.
[2] *Catechismus Romanus*, Pt. II. de Sacramentis, cap. i. § ii.
[3] *Confessio Augustana.*
[4] *Westminster Confession*, cap. xxvii. §§ 1, 2.
[5] Art. xxv.

forgiveness and neutralization of the believer's sin. And it has just been seen that this life of restored communion with the Father displayed itself in the believer by a ceaseless self-surrender which assumed the form of a daily and hourly obedience to the Father's will; in other words, this life of restored intercourse with God manifested itself by a life of self-sacrifice which gave eminent expression to its deepest wishes by acts of sacrifice. To these truths the New Testament adds another, that these very acts of sacrifice, these acts of prayer and thanksgiving and surrender, become themselves the channels of divine blessing, and the instruments by which a deeper assurance of the divine favour is attained; these sacrifices of the Christian are, in fact, endowed with a sacramental power. By the atonement of Jesus every act of the believer becomes a sacrament. Thus faith itself becomes the channel for the sense of justification; the characteristic acts of Christian worship are sacramental, since prayer in its various forms of petition or thanksgiving or communion becomes the instrument of the divine favour, of the divine acceptance, of the divine sanctification, and of the divine intercourse. The very discharge as in the divine sight of all the manifold duties of life, is itself a series of sacraments, and the performance of these common duties is itself a most blessed means of grace.[1]

[1] Of course the author is aware that this use of the word *sacrament* is not warranted by its etymology. *Sacrament* is a translation (in the most literal sense of the word) of the Latin *sacramentum*, a derivative of *sacrare*, the synonyms of which are such words as *dedicare*, *initiare*. The classical use of the word was twofold; it stood for the sum of money which was deposited by litigants with the Pontifex Maximus according to Roman law, and it also stood for the military oath of allegiance (see Varro, *De Linguâ Latinâ*, Book IV.). Further, the word *sacrament* is of course not a biblical term. All the author asserts is that he has exercised the acknowledged privilege of explorers, and adopted this word to express concisely and clearly a most important distinction; and that in this adoption, for the purpose of accurate knowledge, he has only been assigning to the word in question a definition commonly given and commonly understood. The first traces of this use of *sacramentum* are to be found in Tertullian, who occasionally employed it as a synonym for μυστήριον, which had already acquired the modern idea of sacrament; and from the time of Tertullian until now the word has been in common use by theologians with a more or less definite, but parallel, connotation. It may be of interest to know that Tertullian, according to Rückert, used *sacramentum* in four different senses, three of which have fallen into abeyance (see Rückert, *Das Abendmahl*, p. 315).

If, then, in the Old Testament, the doctrine of Sacrifice resolved itself ultimately into two principles, that of atonement and that of presentation, this is equally the case with the doctrine of the New Testament, although, in accordance with the scriptural system of development, these two principles assume different forms. Both under the Old Covenant and under the New, the forgiveness of sins by virtue of their atonement is equally taught; but the symbolic and typical atonement by animal blood of the Old has assumed a higher phase in the New, and has become the actual and antitypical atonement by the death of Jesus. So also the possibility of approach to God by the medium of sacrifice was proclaimed in the Old Testament and in the New; but the symbolic and typical presentation of flesh and corn and wine of the Old has become transformed into the genuine and antitypical presentation in the New of head and hand, of heart and sympathy, of will and act. And the parallel between the two dispensations is similarly maintained in the matter of sacraments; for whilst in the two cases the acts of sacrifice are themselves different, they equally produce their accredited effects by the interblending of supernatural power.

But there are two Christian rites which have in all Protestant Churches monopolized the sacramental idea, and which undoubtedly occupy a peculiar place in the Christian system. In these two instances, the characteristic feature of Mosaism, the conveyance of religious truth by symbol, has been retained, and, if the testimony of the Gospels and Epistles be received, by the divine command. Of course we refer to the rites of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. These rites occupy, as we have said, an exceptional position in the Christian system; for whilst the contrast between Mosaism and Christianity is nowhere more clearly seen than in the fact that the worship of the former, whatever else it was, was palpably symbolic, the worship of the latter as palpably substituted word and act for rite and image; nevertheless, astonishing though the fact may be, the Christian faith has in these two instances evident recourse to sensuous presentment. With the initiatory rite of Baptism we are no further concerned than to draw attention to the parallel position it holds with

the Christian sacraments of prayer and faith and self-abnegation; with the Lord's Supper the case is different. By the circumstances of its institution, the Lord's Supper is largely connected with the Jewish sacrifices; and not only the words of its inauguration, but the time, seem to suggest some sacrificial import. From this one symbolic sacrament so closely allied with our subject, we have intentionally kept aloof in our previous exposition; now the examination of the New Testament doctrine of Sacrifice can only be completed by a determination from scriptural evidence of the leading features of the great controversy which this rite has evoked within the Christian Church.

The questions to be decided are, first, "Was the Lord's Supper a sacrifice?" and, secondly, "If so, in what sense?"

It is advisable to place before ourselves the scriptural evidence available. There are five passages of Scripture which directly refer to the Lord's Supper,[1] or, as it is also termed in the New Testament, "the Table of the Lord"[2] (possibly "the Breaking of Bread"[3]); or, as it was termed in more modern times, "the Eucharist;"[4] or, as if it were the sacrament *par excellence*, "The Sacrament." These passages are contained in the twenty-sixth chapter of Matthew, the fourteenth chapter of Mark, the twenty-second chapter of Luke, the sixteenth and seventeenth verses of the tenth chapter, and the twenty-third to the twenty-ninth verses of the eleventh chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. These passages plainly teach—

First, That the Lord's Supper was instituted at the Paschal Feast of which our Lord and His disciples partook on the night preceding His crucifixion.

Secondly, That the materials employed in its institution were bread and wine.

Thirdly, That the ritual adopted was, with the bread—a

[1] Δεῖπνον κυριακόν, 1 Cor. xi. 29. [2] Τράπεζα κυρίου, 1 Cor. x. 21.

[3] Κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου, Acts ii. 42. It is questionable whether this referred to the Lord's Supper.

[4] Εὐχαριστία (Latinized into *Eucharistia*), because, as Chrysostom says, *In Mattheum*, Homilia xxv. 3, πολλῶν ἐστιν εὐεργετημάτων ἀνάμνησις was already in common use in the time of Irenæus, and thenceforth became the common designation employed by the Fathers and during the *Middle Age*.

blessing, a breaking, a distribution with the words, "This is my body," and a partaking by the disciples; with the wine —a taking of the cup, a blessing, a distribution with words to the effect, "This is my blood, shed for the remission of sins, the blood of the New Covenant," and a partaking by the disciples.

Fourthly, That the design of the rite was to hold the death of Christ in memorial, and to "eat the body" and "drink the blood" of Christ; subsidiary designs being the avowal of faith in His death, and the avowal of union with those who hold that faith.

Fifthly, That the prerequisites for profitable participation are, a desire to hold the Lord's death in remembrance, and ability to discern the Lord's body.

Having, therefore, the scriptural statements before us, we return to our question: "Was the rite of the Eucharist a sacrifice, or was it not?" Many difficulties have been imported into the discussion, not the least of which have arisen from a failure to state exactly what is meant by the term "sacrifice." In the great sacramental controversy, it is imperative that there should be at the outset a definition of terms; friends will infallibly be classed with foes, and foes with friends, by any neglect of this first principle of all discussion. For our part, we prefer to advance to the main question by first ascertaining *whether the Lord's Supper was in any way connected with Old Testament Sacrifice, and so deserving of the appellation "sacrificial."*

That the Lord's Supper was intended by its Founder to be understood as in some way connected with the ancient sacrifices, may be inferred from the following particulars: First, the time of its institution; second, the symbols selected; and, third, the words addressed to the communicants.

In the first place, it is unquestionable that our Lord instituted His memorial feast whilst celebrating, in company with His disciples, the great Paschal Supper. The Synoptists are unanimous in affirming that the meal of which our Lord partook on the eve of the crucifixion was the Passover meal,— the lamb which had been previously selected and solemnly slain in the precincts of the Temple, and which was eaten

with serious rites when the evening shades fell upon the 14th Nisan. It is true that the Apostle John speaks of the unwillingness of the Pharisees to enter the judgment hall on the morning of the hurried trial, "lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the Passover;" nevertheless, before rejecting, as so many have done, either the testimony of the Synoptists or that of John as untrustworthy, it is certainly prudent to inquire whether any reconciliation of the discrepancy is possible. And it happens that a solution of the difficulty, which has not a vestige of strain, is to hand. That reconciliation is, that when the Apostle John refers to "eating the Passover," he does not of necessity refer to eating the Paschal lamb; and that when he speaks of the preparation, he means the preparation for the Sabbath, and not the preparation for the Feast of Unleavened Bread. In support of these assertions the following facts may be adduced. It is the common custom with John, as it was with certain writers of the Old Testament, to designate the whole Feast of Unleavened Bread by the name of Passover; and according to well-accredited testimonies, there were special festal-offerings, or *chagigah*, which were partaken of on the day succeeding the Passover supper: "to eat the Passover" may, therefore, mean "to continue the celebration commenced on the previous evening." Further, the word "preparation," if the testimony of Josephus as well as of the Evangelists be received, seems to have become a common appellation for the day preceding the weekly Sabbath; the preparation of the Passover would thus be the day of preparation for the Sabbath in the Week of Unleavened Bread—that is to say, the Friday, as commonly supposed. Still, this is "the most litigated of questions in the criticism of the Gospels;"[1] and, without any pretence at finally disposing of the matter, we simply state what seems an adequate resolution of the difficulty, at the same time emphatically reasserting that, whatever be the interpretation of the words of John, that interpretation can neither outweigh nor invalidate the united testimony of the other evangelists.[2]

[1] Tholuck, *Commentar zum Evang. Johannis*, chap. xiii. ver. 1 (translated in *Foreign Theological Library*).

[2] The ablest and most judicial summary of this great controversy known to

Secondly, the elements selected by our Lord to become the impressive symbols of His Supper were inseparably associated in the mind of the Jew, and therefore in the minds of the apostles, with sacrificial observance. Unleavened bread and wine formed, as has been so frequently seen in the former part of this work, the common material of the *minchah;* and, as far as the one element is concerned,—that sacred unleavened bread which was inextricably interwoven with thoughts of the Passover, the shew-bread, and every offering of cooked meal which was made in the holy places by priest or layman,—its one connection for the Jew was with the rites of sacrifice. But a further point may be urged: wine and unleavened bread were the common accompaniments of the Paschal lamb. With regard to the unleavened bread, the divine command at the primary institution of the Passover was so peremptory, that, in presence of the words, "They shall eat the flesh in that night, roast with fire, and unleavened bread. . . . In all your habitations ye shall eat unleavened bread," its continuous use cannot be doubted. And that at the time of our Lord wine was also a feature of the Paschal feast is indubitable. Many changes had come over the letter, if not over the spirit, of the Sinaitic injunctions, and this of wine at the Passover was one. From Jewish writings extant which refer to that time, the Paschal celebration would seem to have been as follows: the supper began with a cup of wine; the bitters were then set upon the table, and afterwards unleavened bread, the *charoseth* (or bitter

the author is that given in *The Bible Student's Life of our Lord in its Historical, Chronological, and Geographical Relations*, by the Rev. Samuel Andrews, pp. 368–397. It is to be regretted that the valuable and eloquent *Life of Christ*, by Dr. F. W. Farrar, should have given a wide circulation to the opinion that this feast at which our Lord presided "was not the ordinary Jewish Passover, but a meal eaten by our Lord and His apostles on the previous evening, Thursday, Nisan 13, to which a quasi-Paschal character was given, but which was intended to supersede the Jewish festival by one of far deeper and diviner significance" (see Excursus x.: *Was the Lord's Supper a Passover?*). That this last Supper was not of a "quasi-Paschal character," a single fact is sufficient to show,—a "quasi-Paschal" lamb no priest would have slain on the day before the legal time. Nor is the difficulty removed by Canon Farrar's statement, that "the Synoptists, while they speak of bread and wine, give not the remotest hint which could show that a *lamb* formed the most remarkable portion of the feast." But is it so? What, then, did Mark and Luke mean by speaking of the Day of Unleavened Bread, "*when the Passover must be killed*"?

sauce made of raisins, dates, and vinegar), the lamb, and the *chagigah* or peace-offering. The head of the household then pronounced a blessing, and, taking the herbs, dipped them in the *charoseth*, and he and all with him ate "as much as an olive;" then came a second cup of wine, and after sundry blessings and explanations of the object of the feast, there was a free eating of the flesh of the *chagigah* and the roasted lamb, followed at intervals by two other cups of wine and the singing of the Hallelujah Psalms.[1] It is confessedly difficult to decide upon the minor features of the several benedictions and the traditional customs currently adopted at the commencement of this era, but there is no room for doubt that wine (red wine, "that it should taste and look" like wine, as the Babylonian Talmud expressively says) formed as constant a feature as the unleavened bread.

Thirdly, the very words addressed by our Lord to the disciples would establish in their minds some connection between this newly instituted rite and the sacrificial worship of Mosaism. Especially were there two expressions in which this connection would be infallibly suggested—that which referred to His blood as that of the New Covenant, and that which designated this Supper a "memorial." The scene which, by way of contrast, Jesus called up by His reference to the New Covenant has been already referred to;[2] the words imply that, with all the differences of ritual, circumstances, and surroundings, there was some fundamental resemblance between the newly instituted rite and that ancient ceremony performed by Moses; there can be no contrast between utterly diverse things, and the contrast between the New Covenant and the Old pointed to some latent bond of union. And it is also remarkable that the uncommon word "memorial," "remembrance," "anamnesis,"—"This do for my memorial,"—was also employed in connection with sacrificial ceremonies of various kinds; the shew-bread was "for a memorial,"[3] "the blowing of trumpets" was to constitute the burnt-offerings and festal-offerings "a memorial" before God.[4]

[1] See Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ*, Exercitationes in Matt. xxvi. 26; also the erudite article on the "Passover," by Dr. Ginsburg, in Kitto's *Cyclopædia*. [2] See p. 280. [3] Lev. xxiv. 7. [4] Num. x. 10.

Thus, then, it would appear that there is abundant evidence for concluding that the Lord's Supper was, and was intended by its Founder to be, in some way connected with the sacrificial ceremonies of the pre-Christian dispensation. The Lord's Supper was in some sense a sacrifice—that is to say, it had some manifest connection with the sacrificial injunctions propounded by Moses; but the great question is, in what sense? To generally describe the great Christian sacrament under so loose and (even when scripturally used) so comprehensive a term, is to do but little. The point in dispute is not whether the Eucharist may be loosely designated a sacrifice, but whether it is a *sacrificium propitiatorium. In what sense*, then, *was the Lord's Supper intended by our Lord and described by His apostles to be a sacrifice?*

A reply to this important question will be found by considering—first, the symbols employed; secondly, the words of institution; and thirdly, the manifest purpose of the rite.

Too much stress can scarcely be laid upon the fact that bread and wine were the symbols employed by the Lord,—bread and wine, not flesh and blood. By the very selection the new rite was thus allied with the bloodless offerings of the Old Testament, and removed from the category of the offerings of blood. The entire ritual of blood was thus passed over, and those elements only were transferred into the characteristic rite of the new *régime* which an elaborate education had shown to possess no potency of atonement. What must have been the inevitable inference made by the apostles when once their minds were free and open to the novel influences and customs which were beginning to environ them? It was bread and wine which constituted the materials of the great Christian rite; but bread and wine it was only possible under the dispensation of their boyhood to present in company with burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, and never with sacrifices for sin and trespass; bread and wine it had only been possible to present to God under the preliminary Jewish scheme *after atonement had been made* by the effusion of blood. What followed? Must not the conclusion have slowly but irresistibly dawned upon them that this ordinance was a something only now become possible, since

an atonement for sin was made once for all? The mere use of these symbols, after the long initiatory education of Mosaism, quite apart from the things they symbolized, would unerringly suggest that they were in some way connected with a finished atonement. If the Supper was a sacrifice, it was not a sacrifice for sin.

Then, in the second place, the exact nature of this symbolic sacrifice may be gathered from the words of its institution. These words were in effect these three:—"This is My body," spoken at the distribution of the bread; "This is the blood of the New Covenant, shed for many for the remission of sins," spoken at the distribution of the wine; and, "This do for My memorial," also spoken, according to the testimony of Luke, at the distribution of the bread, and, according to the testimony of Paul, with which that of Luke is not inconsistent, at the distribution of the wine. It is convenient to commence with the third, although each of these sayings has its importance for the question in hand. The exact significance of these words might be conveyed by the following paraphrase: "Celebrate this rite, and so perpetually recall Me and My work to mind." Now, singularly enough, the Passover itself was enjoined by the Lord with these words: "This day shall be unto you for a memorial." What, then, the Passover had been to the Jews—a sacred reminiscence, that henceforth this Supper should be, as sacred and memorable a reminiscence. As, when the Jewish year had run its course, the first month of the opening year was consecrated by that national remembrance of the deliverance from Egypt at the Passover, so from time to time in the Christian life there should be a season of solemn remembrance when the deliverance wrought by Jesus on Calvary should be recalled to mind. The paraphrase recently made may therefore be appropriately expanded to include this manifest reference, thus: "Celebrate this rite, as you and your fathers throughout your national history have celebrated the Passover, not for a memorial of the deliverance effected at the Red Sea, but for My memorial, to recall Me and My work of deliverance to mind." But it was a peculiar aspect of Christ's nature, a precise feature of His great work, which was to be

recalled. "For My memorial" is limited by "This is My body," "This is My blood." Upon the symbolic nature of these statements it is unnecessary to linger. Those who insist upon the literal meaning being attached to the words, "This is My body," ought in all consistency to insist upon the literal meaning being attached to the words, "This drinking cup is the New Covenant;" but we are not aware that the transubstantiation [1] or consubstantiation of the chalice has ever been advocated: all we would say is, that the apostles, from the whole experience of their lives, were familiar with the symbolic nature of the Jewish sacrifices of every kind, and the phrase would be no more strange to them, as the Lord distributed the bread with the words, "This is My body," than the phrase, "This is the blood of the Covenant." [2] What it is important to remember is, that both these phrases, the one spoken at the distribution of the bread and that spoken at the distribution of the wine, alike pointed to the death of Christ, the broken body, the spilt blood, as the subject of remembrance. The sacrifice of the Lord's Supper was thus a sacrifice allied to the Paschal sacrifice, but memorializing the atonement wrought by the death of Jesus.

Further, in addition to being a sacrifice in remembrance of the death of Christ, it may be inferred from the purposes assigned for its institution, that the Lord's Supper was to be a sacrament. To its symbolic nature it added a sacramental. That such also was its purpose might be assumed both from its divine institution at all, and from the position it occupied relatively to the sacramental sacrifices of Judaism; in fact, it would be next to impossible, on the one hand, to dissociate from the fact that our Lord Himself had instituted this rite the further fact that it was instituted to work some spiritual advantage, and, on the other hand, for the apostles, with all the prepossessions of their early religious training, not to see in this ordinance a means of divine blessing. But the express

[1] This word was first used by Hildebert of Tours,—Sermo v., *In Cœna Domini.*

[2] In Ex. xxiv. 8, Moses is represented as saying in the Hebrew, "*Behold* the blood of the Covenant;" significantly enough, in Heb. x. 20, this is rendered by "*This is* the blood of the Covenant," the Hebrew *hinneh* by the Greek τοῦτο.

words of the New Testament countenance the sacramental import of the Eucharist. "Take, eat, this is My body;" "Drink ye all of it, this blood shed for the remission of sins,"—these very words imply a sacramental significance. "Eat this body" is the command, not "eat this bread;" "drink this blood" was said, not "drink this wine;" it is no mere eating bread and drinking wine in remembrance of the dead, it is a spiritual participation, renewed at every celebration, in the effects wrought by the death of Jesus. Besides, how could Paul dwell upon the ability to discern the Lord's body as the necessary prerequisite for communion, unless that prerequisite was to conduct into some great privilege? A participation on the part of a sceptic might equally serve to keep the name and work of Christ in remembrance; none but a believer could receive sacramental advantage.

From an examination of Scripture, then, reason has been seen for concluding that in a certain loose sense the Lord's Supper may be called a sacrifice, inasmuch as it was deliberately associated by its Founder with the sacrificial rites, the rites of presentation and atonement, of the Old Testament. Reason has also been seen for concluding that, if the more precise sacrificial nature of the Eucharist be desired, that rite was allied to the rites of presentation which the Law permitted to be made when atonement had been secured by the effusion of blood, and that the rite in question in its inmost nature symbolically represented the atonement wrought by the death of Jesus, and sacramentally renewed the benefits of that atonement in the soul of the believing celebrant. But the main elements of the scriptural conceptions of the Lord's Supper will be more vividly seen in contrast with the various views of that ordinance which have obtained during the history of the Christian Church.

CHAPTER X.

A REVIEW OF OTHER VIEWS UPON THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

"Wherever there is a deep truth unrecognised, misunderstood, it will force its way into men's hearts; it will take pernicious forms if it cannot take healthful ones."—F. W. Robertson, *Sermon on the First Miracle*, "The Glory of the Virgin Mother."

In answer to the questions whether the Lord's Supper is a sacrifice? and if so, in what sense? the reply has been made that the Lord's Supper, like the Paschal meal, is a sacrifice, a presentation to God, at once symbolic and sacramental,—symbolic, since, under the forms of broken bread and effused wine, the dead body and spilt life of Him Who has remitted our sins by His death is called to mind; and sacramental, inasmuch as the remembrance of the death of Christ under these symbolic forms is the divinely appointed channel of a special apprehension of and participation in the power of that death, the symbolic wine becoming spiritually stimulating, and the symbolic bread spiritually sustaining. These views we must now be able to substantiate when they are contrasted with all others.

Five principal views have been held upon the nature of the Lord's Supper,—the Romanist, the Lutheran, the Calvinistic, the Zwinglian, and the Socinian. To bring what we hold to be the scriptural view into due prominence, we shall pass these several theories under review.

Various incompatible theories of the Eucharist were advocated by leading theologians of the great Western Church prior to the Council of Trent; but, inasmuch as it is held that the decisions of that Council are decisive as to what, on pain of excommunication, a Romanist must believe, we call by the name of Romanist that view first authoritatively defined in

the *Canones et Decreta Concilii Tridentini.* In the thirteenth session a decree was made, and certain canons appended, "Concerning the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist." The decree ran as follows: "The sacrosanct œcumenical and general synod of Trent, lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, under the presidency of the legate and nuncii of the Apostolic See, albeit met under the special leading and guidance of the Holy Ghost to propound the true and ancient doctrine concerning the faith and the sacraments, and to prepare a remedy for all the heresies and other most serious inconveniences by which the Church of God is at this time unhappily disturbed and split into many and diverse sects, had from the very first made a special determination to tear up root and branch the tares of execrable errors and schisms which the enemy in these calamitous times of ours has sown in the doctrine of the faith and the use and cultus of the holy eucharist, which, be it remembered, our Lord left in His Church as a symbol of the unity and love by which He desired all Christians to be bound and united together. Therefore the same sacrosanct synod, transmitting that healthy and sound doctrine concerning this venerable and divine sacrament of the eucharist, which the catholic church, instructed by Jesus Christ our Lord Himself and His apostles, and taught by the Holy Ghost Who daily suggests to it all truth, has always retained and will preserve till the end of time, prohibits all the faithful in Christ from believing concerning the most holy eucharist, or from presuming to teach or preach anything else than what is expounded and defined in this decree." In the first chapter of the decree the doctrine of the Real Presence is then stated: "At the outset the sacred synod teaches and openly and simply professes that, after the consecration of the bread and wine, there is really and substantially contained in the blessed sacrament of the eucharist, under the form of these sensible things, our Lord Jesus Christ, very God and verily man. Nor is there any contradiction in saying that our Lord Himself always sits at the right hand of the Father in the heavens according to the natural mode of existence, and that nevertheless His substance is sacramentally present to us in many other places, and in that method of existence, which, scarcely

describable in words although that is possible with God, we can readily come to understand by thought illumined by faith, and ought most constantly to believe. For so all our elders, as many as were in the true Church of Christ, who have discoursed concerning this most holy sacrament, have openly professed that our Redeemer instituted this admirable sacrament at the last supper, when, subsequently to the benediction of the bread and wine, He averred in clear and eloquent words that He proffered them His own very body and His own blood (*se suum ipsius corpus illis præbere ac suum sanguinem*); and since these words, kept in mind and related by the holy evangelists, and afterwards repeated by the godlike Paul, present that appropriate and most evident signification, according to which they were understood by the Fathers, it is truly a most scandalous shame that they should be twisted by a few contentious and wicked men into fictitious and imaginary tropes, in which the truth of the flesh and blood of Christ is denied, contrary to the universal sentiment of the church, which, always regarding with grateful and ready mind this most excellent benefit of Christ as the pillar and prop of the truth, has abhorred as Satanic these renderings devised by impious men." The second chapter thus proceeds to state the reason of the institution of this sacrament: "Therefore our Lord, when about to depart from this world unto the Father, instituted this sacrament, in which He poured forth, so to speak, the riches of the divine love to man, making a memorial of His wonderful works, and exhorted us in its participation to cultivate His memory, and to announce His death until he should come to judge the world. For He wished this sacrament to be taken as a spiritual food for souls, by which those who live in His life might be fed and comforted; for He said, 'He who eateth me, shall live by me;' and as an antidote by which we might be freed from daily faults and preserved from mortal sins. He wished it, besides, to be a pledge of our future glory and perpetual felicity, and thus a symbol of that one body, of which He is Himself the head, and to which He wished us as members most closely joined together in the bond of faith and hope and charity to be united, that we might all say the same thing, and that there

be no division amongst us." The super-excellence of this sacrament is next treated: "This indeed is common to the most holy eucharist and the other sacraments, that it is a symbol of a sacred thing, and a visible form of an invisible grace; but the excellency and peculiarity of this sacrament lie here, that the other sacraments only have a power of sanctifying when they have been used, but the eucharist is a source of sanctity before use (*ante usum*). For the apostles had not received as yet the eucharist from the hand of the Lord, when He nevertheless Himself affirmed that it was His own body He proffered; and it has always been believed in the Church of God, that immediately after the consecration the true body of our Lord and His true blood, together with His soul and divinity, existed under the form of bread and wine (*statim post consecrationem verum Domini nostri corpus verumque ejus sanguinem sub panis et vini specie una cum ipsius anima et divinitate existere*): but indeed that the body existed under the form of bread and the blood under the form of wine from verbal necessity (*ex vi verborum*), whilst in fact the body existed under the form of wine, and the blood under the form of bread, and the soul under both, by the natural influence of that connection and concomitance, by which the parts of Christ our Lord, Who has now risen from the dead never more to die, are mutually connected; moreover the divinity is there, because of that admirable hypostatic union of His Person with body and soul. Wherefore it is most true that He is contained under each or either form. For the whole and undiminished Christ (*totus enim et integer Christus*) exists under the form of bread and under any portion of that form, and the whole Christ exists under the form of wine or any of its portions." In the next chapter the term "transubstantiation" is adopted: "Now, since Christ our Redeemer has said that what He offered under the form of bread was really His own body, the Church of God has always been so convinced, and this sacred synod now declares it afresh, viz. that by means of the consecration of the bread and wine a conversion has been made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His

blood; and this conversion is conveniently and appropriately called by the holy catholic church 'Transubstantiation.'" Other chapters follow, which need not be recapitulated, upon the ritual to be observed in the ordinance, upon the reservation of it for the sick, upon the suitable preparation for participation, and upon the reasons for its frequent use. To the decree certain canons were added which served to bring the express teaching upon the subject into greater prominence, as the decree itself says: "Since it is not enough to say what is true without detecting and rebutting error, it has seemed good to the sacred synod to append these canons, in order that all, the catholic doctrine being well known, may also understand what ought to be guarded against and avoided as heresies." The following are these admonitory canons: 1. "If any one shall deny that in the sacrament of the most holy eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially contained the body and blood together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and thus the whole Christ, but shall say that He is only present there symbolically, or figuratively, or potentially; let him be anathema." 2. "If any one shall say, that in the sacrament of the blessed eucharist there remains the substance of the bread and wine, together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall deny that wondrous and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, the forms merely of bread and wine remaining, which conversion indeed the catholic church most aptly calls transubstantiation; let him be anathema." 3. "If any one shall deny that in the venerable sacrament of the eucharist the whole Christ is contained under each form and under the single parts of each form when they are separated; let him be anathema." 4. "If any one shall say, that after the completion of the consecration there is not in the admirable sacrament of the eucharist the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, but that that only happens *in usu*, when it is partaken of, and not before or after, and that the true body of the Lord does not remain in the consecrated wafers or particles, which are reserved or remain after communion; let him be anathema." 5. "If any one shall say, either that

the chief fruit of the most holy eucharist is the remission of sins, or that other effects do not proceed from it; let him be anathema." 6. "If any one shall say, that in the holy sacrament of the eucharist Christ the only begotten Son of the Father is not to be adored by external ritual also, and that He is not to be reverenced either in peculiar festive celebration or to be solemnly borne about in procession, according to the laudable and universal rite and custom of holy church, or that He should not be publicly proffered to the people for adoration, and that His adorers are idolaters; let him be anathema." 7. "If any one shall say, that the holy eucharist ought not to be reserved in the sacristy, but that it should be necessarily distributed immediately after consecration to those who are present, or that it ought not to be carried to the sick with due reverence; let him be anathema." 8. "If any one shall say, that Christ as exhibited in the eucharist is only spiritually to be eaten, and not sacramentally and really as well; let him be anathema." 9. "If any one shall deny that the faithful in Christ of both sexes, individually and collectively, when they have attained years of discretion, should commune every year at Easter at least, according to the injunction of holy mother church; let him be anathema." 10. "If any one shall say, that the celebrating priest himself may not partake; let him be anathema." The eleventh canon, which need not be quoted at length, insists upon the fact that faith is not sufficient preparation for communion, without auricular confession.

To these Tridentine statements upon the Eucharist, the following extracts from the decree and canons of the Twenty-second Session, concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass, should be added: "Since under the former covenant, according to the Apostle Paul, there was on account of the weakness of the Levitical priesthood no finality, it was necessary, according to the ordinance of God the Father of mercies, that another priest should arise after the order of Melchisedec, Jesus Christ our Lord, Who might be able to complete all, as many as should be sanctified, and bring them to perfection. He Who was God, therefore, and our Lord, although He was about to offer Himself to God the Father once upon the altar of the cross

by the medium of death, in order that He might there work eternal redemption, yet because His priesthood was not to be extinguished by death, at the last supper on the night in which He was betrayed, in order that He might leave a sacrifice to His chosen spouse the church, as the nature of man requires, by which that cruel death once accomplished upon the cross might be represented, and His memory remain to the end of time, and the salutary virtue of that death be applied to the remission of those sins which are daily committed by us, declaring that He was eternally appointed a priest after the order of Melchisedec, offered His body and His blood to God the Father under the forms of bread and wine, and delivered them to His apostles under the symbols of the same things that they might partake, thus constituting them priests of the New Testament, and enjoined them and their successors in the priesthood to offer by these words, 'This do in remembrance of me,' as the catholic church has always understood and taught. For, the ancient passover having been celebrated, which a multitude of the children of Israel offered as a memorial of the exodus from Egypt, He appointed as a new passover that He Himself should be offered by the church by the agency of the priests under visible signs, for a memorial of His passage from this world to the Father, when He redeemed us by the pouring out of His own blood, and snatched us from the power of darkness and transferred us to His kingdom. And this indeed is that pure offering which cannot be defiled by any unworthiness or wickedness of the offerers, which clean offering the Lord by the mouth of Malachi predicted should be offered in every place to His name, which should be great among the Gentiles, and which the Apostle Paul clearly hints at in his letter to the Corinthians, when he says that those who have been polluted by partaking of the table of demons, cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord, understanding in both places by the table, the altar. This, in fine, is that offering which was prefigured by the various forms of sacrifices in the time of nature and of the Law, seeing that it embraces all the good things signified by them, as if it were the consummation and completion of them all." These opinions were also thrown into

strong relief by appropriate canons. Thus the first canon says: "If any one shall say that there is not a true and proper sacrifice offered to God in the mass . . .; let him be anathema." The third canon says: "If any one shall say that the sacrifice of the mass is only a sacrifice of praise or of giving of thanks, or that it is a bare commemoration of the sacrifice completed on the cross, but not a propitiatory sacrifice; or that it benefits the participant alone, and ought not to be offered for the sins, penalties, satisfactions, and other necessities for the living and for the dead; let him be anathema."

The decisions of the Tridentine Council have been given at some length, because, in addition to their expression of the Romanist sentiments concerning the Eucharist, they present a characteristic example of the ecclesiastical arrogance and the scholastic peculiarities of statement which are largely the secret of the sway which the Church of Rome, that most singular compound of truth and error, possesses and maintains. These decisions—to omit the rhetorical fulness of expression as well as minor points of ritual and exhortation—sanction the following assertions concerning the Lord's Supper: First, the Lord's Supper is a symbolic representation of the Lord's death —this is everywhere implied and occasionally expressly stated, although it must be admitted that the symbolic significance of the Supper is sometimes said to be seen in its being a symbol of unity, and even a symbol of the Church; secondly, the Lord's Supper is, by a process of transubstantiation consequent upon the priestly consecration, an actual re-presentation of the body and blood of Christ; thirdly, the Lord's Supper is in the common sense of the word a sacrament, and also in an unusual sense, since the elements employed are not merely channels of divine influence, but possess a potency of their own as the body and blood of Christ; and, fourthly, the Lord's Supper is thus a true, a propitiatory sacrifice, is in fact that sacrifice which all the varied sacrifices of the Old Testament foreshadowed. Into the thrilling controversy concerning that "tremendous mystery" of the Mass, we do not purpose precipitating ourselves; all we propose is, in pursuance of our special plan, to make a few criticisms suggested by our peculiar standpoint.

And, in the first place, be it remarked that, with all its ostentatious display of perspicuity, there is one standing inconsistency in the Tridentine theory of the Eucharist; it is overlooked that the elements employed cannot be at once the body and blood of Jesus, and the symbols of that body and blood. And yet such is the Tridentine theory; for, in the third chapter of the 13th decree already quoted, it is said that the Eucharist possesses this in common with other sacraments, that it is *Symbolum rei sacræ*,—a symbol of a sacred fact, that sacred fact being, as the whole definition shows, the death of Christ, with its adjuncts the broken body and the blood shed; and in the same chapter it is said, that "immediately after consecration there exists under the form of bread and wine the very body and very blood of our Lord, together with His soul and divinity." What can be made of this use of language? It is perfectly true that the word "symbol" is not employed in the Tridentine decrees in the precise and technical sense everywhere adopted in this book, and it is true that there is some ambiguity in answering the questions as to what invisible grace is expressed by the visible forms adopted; none the less is there a gross misuse of language, which undoubtedly covers a considerable mental confusion. To call wine a symbol of blood, or bread a symbol of flesh, is intelligible enough; to say that the bread *is* flesh and the wine *is* blood is intelligible *in verbo* if not *in re*; but to say, as the Tridentine decree does in effect, that the bread is at once the symbol of the flesh of Christ and the flesh itself, and that wine is at once the symbol of the blood of Christ and the blood itself, is to utter a deliberate contradiction.

Again, the objection to the doctrine of the Real Presence may be urged, as has been previously remarked, that if it is founded upon the literal interpretation of the words, "This is My body," consistency demands that there should be a strictly literal interpretation of the words which accompanied the distribution of the wine. The previous objection was based on a misuse of language, this on a hesitant method of biblical interpretation.

Further, our special subject of inquiry suggests that to call the Eucharist a *sacrificium propitiatorium* is contrary to the

usage of the Old Testament and the express statements of the New. What the New Testament actually asserts concerning the nature of the Eucharist has been already passed under review in the last chapter, and the conclusion arrived at was, that in a certain loose sense the Eucharist might be regarded as a sacrifice, inasmuch as it had some parallelism with the Mosaic rites of presentation, but that to call it a "propitiatory sacrifice" was to ignore not only the absence of blood from the ritual, but the absence of any single allusion in the New Testament which might substantiate such a designation. Besides, there was not throughout the whole Old Testament a single instance in which a sacrifice could be called a *sacrificium propitiatorium* in the Romanist sense; propitiatory sacrifices by sacramental power—by the sacramental application of the eternal hypothesis of the death of Jesus—there were in abundance; but propitiatory sacrifices which wrought by some inherent power, and which, to adopt the Tridentine technicality, were valid *ante usum*, were unknown to the Law.

Nor is there any authority for saying that in the Eucharist all the sacrificial types find their antitype. A Romanist would probably rejoice in the conclusion that such a propitiatory sacrifice as his faith celebrates was unknown to the Law, for he would see in this a substantiation of the belief of his co-religionists in the unique nature of the Mass; as a sacrifice *sui generis*, it would be to him, as the Tridentine Council asserted, "that offering which was prefigured by the various forms of sacrifice in the time of nature and of the Law—the consummation and completion of them all." Such a conclusion is contrary to the results of our whole discussion; and it must stand or fall with the acceptance or the rejection of the general conclusions arrived at. Proceeding cautiously, and in strict harmony with the express statements of the Scriptures, we have seen an entire cultus prescribed and to some degree explained in the Old Testament, and we have subsequently ascertained, in our study of the New Testament, that all these earlier sacrifices were but material and transitional forms of that spiritual surrender which the death of Christ has rendered possible to man. To say that the

essential significance of the Mosaic sacrifices in all their variety of range, the one unexplained portion of the Old Testament doctrine, finds its adequate explanation in the institution of the Eucharist, is to falsify and narrow, to say nothing of minimizing the contrast between the old and the new, the exhilarating doctrines of the apostles upon the spiritual priesthood and the spiritual sacrifices even in common life possible to every believer without distinction of rank and calling.

Lastly, we would urge, on the authority of the Old Testament and New Testament sacrifices, that to invoke the aid of a priestly transubstantiation to give effect to the sacramental character of the Eucharist is to multiply miracles unnecessarily. The Romanist himself finds the whole reason of the Eucharist in a spiritual application—we leave out of sight for the moment whether that application be equally effectual with or without faith in the recipient of the body and blood of Christ, that is to say, in a personal participation in the atonement of Christ: why, then, does he find it necessary to enlarge and confuse the conception of a sacrament in this one instance? A sacrament is a symbol which works the effect of the thing symbolized by the gracious intervention of the Father of Mercies: why, then, is it found necessary in this case of the Eucharist to define a sacrament as a symbol and more than a symbol, which works its effect by its individual potency? We would place the Romanist, in fact, upon the horns of the dilemma, that either the atoning sacrifices of the Old Testament wrought their effects by a priestly transubstantiation into the very body and blood of Christ, or, if the ancient effusion of blood worked sacramentally, a similar sacramental application of the merits of the one atonement is all that is needed to explain the one apostolic adoption of the material form of Mosaism.

The second theory of the Eucharist we have mentioned, is the Lutheran. The Confessions of the Lutheran Church resemble those of the Church of Rome, inasmuch as they teach a real presence of the body and blood of Christ. The teaching of the two Churches differs in this respect: the Roman

and Greek Churches maintain that there is a change of substance in the bread and wine immediately consequent on the consecration, so that, the forms of bread and wine remaining, the whole bread has been changed into the body, and the whole wine has been changed into the blood of Christ; whereas the Lutheran Church teaches only a presence of the body and blood of Christ in and under the bread and wine, incapable of further explanation. Thus, it is said in the Augsburg Confession: "It is taught concerning the Lord's Supper, that the body and blood of Christ are truly present and are distributed to those who partake, and those who teach otherwise are censured." So also it is asserted in the Articles of Smalkald: "Concerning the sacrament of the altar, we believe that the bread and wine in the Supper are the true body and blood of Christ, and are to be given to and taken by not only pious but wicked Christians." In Luther's *Catechismus Major*, the question is asked, "What, then, is the sacrament of the altar?" and the reply is given: "It is the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ in and under the bread and wine instituted and commanded by the word of Christ to be eaten and drunk by us Christians." At greater length the *Formula Concordiæ* states: "We believe that in the Supper of the Lord the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present, and that they are truly distributed and taken with the bread and wine. We believe that the words of the testament of Christ are not to be otherwise received than as the words themselves literally express, so that the bread does not signify the absent body of Christ, and the wine the absent blood of Christ, but that by means of a sacramental union the bread and wine are truly the body and blood of Christ;" and some pages farther on: "Further, we reject and condemn that Capernaitic eating of the body of Christ, which the Sacramentarians maliciously ascribe to us, contrary to the testimony of their own conscience, after so many protestations on our part, in order that they may bring our doctrine into disrepute with their hearers, representing, forsooth, as if we teach that the body of Christ is to be torn with the teeth and digested in the human body like any other food. But we believe and assert, according to the clear words of the testament of Christ, a true but super-

natural eating (*veram sed supernaturalem manducationem*) of the body of Christ, just as we also teach that the blood of Christ is truly but supernaturally drunk (*vere supernaturaliter tamen*). But this no one can comprehend with the human senses or reason; wherefore in this matter, as in other articles also of the faith, our intellect ought to submit itself to the obedience of Christ. For this mystery is revealed in the word of God alone, and is understood by faith alone." Yet farther on the *Formula of Concord* also distinctly asserts: "It is taught that just as there are in Christ two distinct and unchanged natures inseparably united, so in the Holy Supper there are two different substances, viz. natural bread and the true natural body of Christ, at the same moment present in the appointed administration of the sacrament." Or the same theory may be expressed in the more guarded and philosophic manner of the modern Lutheran theologians; thus, a Danish professor writes: "The Lutheran doctrine is opposed not only to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, but to the Calvinistic separation of heaven and earth likewise; Christ is not in a literal manner separate from His believing people, so as that they must go to heaven in order to find Him: Christ is on the right hand of God, but the right hand of God is everywhere—*Dextera Dei ubique est.* And therefore He is present wholly and entirely (*totus et integer*) in His Supper, wherein He in an especial manner *wills* to be. There are not in the ordinance two acts, one heavenly and one earthly, distinct from each other, but the heavenly is comprehended in the earthly and visible act, and is organically united therewith, thus constituting one sacramental act. The heavenly substance is communicated in, with, and under the earthly substances. And as the sacramental communion is not a partaking of the corporeal nature of Christ apart from His spiritual nature, no more is it a mere partaking of the spiritual nature of Christ apart from His corporeity; it is one and undivided, a spiritual and corporeal communion."[1]

The Lutheran theory may therefore be summarized thus: First, the Lord's Supper is a symbolic representation of the Lord's death; secondly, it is in some sense an actual represen-

[1] Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics* (T. & T. Clark), p. 436.

tation of the Lord's death; and, thirdly, it has a peculiar sacramental efficacy not only as the earthly instrument by which the divine power works, but as itself in some mysterious way the body and blood of Christ. Into any detailed examination of this theory it is unnecessary to enter. The same criticisms which invalidate the Romish theory affect this. Thus, in the first place, the theory is based upon an inconsistent literalism; secondly, it admits confusion into the idea of a symbol; thirdly, it adduces an unnecessary adjunct to produce an effect purely sacramental.

A third view of the Eucharist is the Zwinglian. Zwingli contended against any presence of Christ in the Supper, and any partaking of Christ. A lucid statement of his peculiar views was given in the address which was sent by the Council of Zürich to pastors and preachers, in which, amongst other things, it was said: "The Supper of the Lord is no other than a feast of the soul; and Christ instituted it as a remembrance of Himself. When a man entrusts himself to the passion and redemption of Christ, he is saved; a sure visible sign of this He has left in the emblems of His body and blood, and bids them both eat and drink in remembrance of Himself."[1] So also in his famous treatise, *On True and False Religion*, he asserts: "The Eucharist or Synaxis or Lord's Supper is therefore nothing else than a commemoration, by which those who firmly believe themselves to have been reconciled to the Father by the death and blood of Christ announce this vivifying death (*hanc vitalem mortem annunciant*), that is, praise, rejoice, and publish. Now it therefore follows that those who come together to this practice or festivity that they may commemorate the death of the Lord, that is, that they may proclaim that they are members of one body, testify by that act that they are one bread."[2] The main feature of the view of Zwingli was that he forcibly, although not always consistently (sometimes towards the close of his life expressing

[1] Winer, *A Comparative View of the Doctrines and Confessions of the Various Communities of Christendom* (T. & T. Clark), p. 269.

[2] Zwinglii *Opera*, edit. Schuler et Schulthess, vol. iii. p. 263. Other allied passages are, vol. ii. pp. 1–223; vol. iii. pp. 145, 228, 239–272.

himself in a manner indistinguishable from the Calvinistic view, to be presently considered), maintained the symbolic nature of the Eucharist, denying at the same time (to adopt our common technicality) any sacramental efficacy.

Nearly allied to the Zwinglian theory was the Socinian, which also denied any sacramental power in the Lord's Supper, whilst clearly propounding its symbolic nature. Thus, in his brief tract upon the Lord's Supper, Socinus himself wrote: "What nearly all imagine, viz. that in this rite our faith at any rate is confirmed, cannot be thought true by any possibility, since it is neither proved by any sacred testimony, nor is there any reason why such a thing should happen. For how can that confirm our faith, which we ourselves do?" or, to quote a modification of this opinion made upon the next page: "It is to be remarked," he says, "that faith may indeed be confirmed and increased in the act of celebrating the Lord's Supper, but not by the taking of the bread and wine, nor by any divine virtue, . . . but by mutual exhortations and the mutual example of obedience to the precepts of Christ, by the solemn commemoration and united celebration of the benefits of God and Christ, and finally by the divine word itself added to the whole ceremony." In like manner it is said in the Racovian Catechism: "(The Supper of the Lord) has been instituted by Christ in order that the faithful may break and eat its bread in company, and drink from the cup, for the sake of proclaiming His death. . . . (To proclaim the Lord's death) is publicly and reverently to return thanks to Christ, that He of His ineffable love towards us allowed His body to be tortured and so to speak broken, and His blood to be shed, and to extol and celebrate this benefit of His. Is there no other cause why the Lord instituted the Supper? None at all; although men have imagined many, when some say that it is a sacrifice for the living and for the dead. Some by its practice hope to attain to the remission of sins and to strengthen faith, and affirm that it recalls to mind the death of the Lord."

Now, how far the Zwinglian and Socinian views were scriptural in their denial of a sacramental efficacy has been already

shown in the preceding chapter, and we need not repeat what was there said. To one point, however, but slightly touched upon previously, attention may advantageously be drawn, viz. the familiarity of the apostles with the sacramental significance of the Old Testament rites. Amidst those rites the apostles had been born and bred, and reverence for them and their methods was an inseparable part of their mental furniture; the question then suggests itself, whether the institution of the Lord's Supper was not a direct address to that mental attitude? Types and ceremonies were ending in antitypes and a spiritual worship, with one conspicuous exception; the question is, whether this Passover of the New Testament would not inevitably carry on the thoughts to a sacramental potency, and whether, in fact, the ordinance itself had not been divinely selected in order that the thoughts of the apostles might be so directed. If the apostles regarded the Mosaic rites as sacramental, could they have failed to regard the one element of the new worship which resembled the old as sacramental too? To answer in the negative is to ignore the entire education of the Jew, divinely sanctioned, even divinely prearranged.

The remaining view is that of Calvin and the Reformed Churches, which, amidst much want of clearness and precision, is substantially the view advocated in this book as the scriptural one—viz., that the Lord's Supper is at once symbolic and sacramental, that is to say, that it is a symbolic representation of the death of Christ, and at the same time a sacramental application to the soul of the believer of the merits of that death. The views of Calvin may be most readily extracted from his *Institutes*, in the seventeenth chapter of the fourth book of which he treats methodically of "the Sacred Supper of Christ and what it confers upon us." It is unnecessary to enter upon his lengthy discussion of the significance of the Supper, and his laborious refutation of contrary opinions; a single sentence will convey his special standpoint: "I say, then," he says, "(as also has always been believed in the Church and is taught to-day by all who entertain right opinions), that the sacred mystery of the Supper lies in two things: in the material symbols, which are presented to the

eyes and represent to us invisible things according to our weak power of comprehension, and in the spiritual truth which is at once figured and exhibited by these symbols. . . . I say, then, that in the mystery of the Supper, Christ is truly presented to us by means of the symbols bread and wine, and thus His body and His blood, in which He fulfilled all obedience whilst achieving righteousness for us, by which fact, forsooth, we in the first place coalesce into one body with Him, and then being made partakers of His substance, we also experience in the communication of all good things some moral support."[1] The same view has been well expressed in the Westminster Confession as follows: "Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible elements in this sacrament, do then also inwardly by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporally, but spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all benefits of His death. The body and blood of Christ being then not corporally or carnally in, with, or under the bread and wine; yet as really, but spiritually, present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are to their outward senses."[2] It is such views of the Eucharist which insist upon the symbolic aspect of the feast, and at the same time and equally upon its sacramental aspect, which alone express with any accuracy the biblical conception of the great New Testament rite, and which, harmonizing in significance as well as in form with the rites of the Mosaic worship, preserve and illustrate the continuity of the divine revelations.

The New Testament doctrine of Christian Sacrifice is now complete. Briefly stated, that doctrine is, that by means of the atonement of Christ it is possible for man to offer to the Almighty spiritual sacrifices, that is to say, the entire product and the isolated acts, social, civil, and religious, of a chastened and believing spirit. Sacrifice is no longer, it has been seen, a presentation of bloody and bloodless material, but a presentation to God of the whole man, body, soul, and spirit, in reliance upon the finished work of Christ. It has been further

[1] *Institutio Christianæ Religionis*, Tholuck's 2d edition, Part II. p. 407.
[2] Cap. xxix. sec. 7.

seen that, as in the case of the Old and New Testament doctrines of Atonement, so also in that of the Old and New Testament doctrines of Presentation, the ancient and modern forms are related to each other as type and antitype, this explaining that, and that foretelling this. In fact, it has become evident during the course of this discussion, that, for the unresolved features in the essential significance of sacrifice properly so called, a parallel interpretation has been found to that which removed the great cardinal difficulty of the essential significance of atonement by effusion of animal blood; for, as in the latter case the mystery vanished in the light of the cross, so in the former case perplexity has ended in the light of the self-surrender which the cross first made possible. If it has been further seen that in one conspicuous instance the sensuous form of the Mosaic and Patriarchal worship was retained in the New Testament, it has also become evident that so extremely exceptional a retention was specially made to answer an important end; it was not that such a survival of ritual stamped the whole character of the age in which it was employed, but it was that, in addition to the secondary effect of establishing continuity by an intermediate form, this was manifestly a "survival of the fittest," a deliberate selection of a rudimentary form of religious service on the ground of general utility. Mosaic in form but Christian in essence, the Lord's Supper enforced Christian consolation the more admirably for its Mosaic method of sensuous appeal. The Lord's Supper was not a contradiction to the Christian doctrine of Sacrifice; it was an illustration of that doctrine under pre-Christian forms. Thus, in the course of our continued inquiry, the New Testament doctrine of Christian Sacrifice has been stated, and the doubtful elements of the Old Testament doctrine have been elucidated.

CHAPTER XI.

SACRIFICE IN THE HEAVENLY WORLD.

"As the Jewish high priest, after the solemn sacrifice for the people on the great Day of Atonement, went into the Holy of Holies with the blood of the victim and sprinkled it upon the mercy-seat, so Christ has entered into heaven itself to present (as it were) before the throne that sacred tabernacle which was the instrument of His passion,—His pierced hands and wounded side,—in token of the atonement which He has effected for the sins of the world."—J. H. NEWMAN, *Sermon for the Feast of the Ascension*, "Mysteries in Religion."

IN the chapter upon the New Testament doctrine of Atonement, that doctrine was stated to consist of, *inter alia*,—the doctrine of the *necessity*, of the *nature*, and of the *effects* of the work of Christ. The *necessity*, first seen in time at the Fall, lay in that righteousness of God which could not grant an unconditional forgiveness to the sinner, and in that divine love which yearned with an inexpressible and paternal yearning after the prodigal child; it lay in the conscious and unconscious consequences of that "first disobedience" in the nature of man; and it further lay in the very nature and office of the Word, Whose it was to create and preserve and judge,—in all things revealing the Father. The *nature* of that work of Christ, it was seen, was twofold,—the tasting death for every man, the voluntary and vicarious submission to the by us unknown and unknowable curse pronounced upon sin; and, in the second place, the impartation of a divine life, by the aid of which the sinful propensities of frail human nature might be corrected and the unhinged balance restored. As to the *effects* of the work of Christ, it was seen that the opponent attributes of the Father were at once reconciled and brought into play, the office of the Son was not only preserved intact but made nobly conspicuous, whilst man himself was started upon that career of resuscitation which was only to have an end in complete restoration at

the resurrection of the just. It was also evident that this work of Christ had been an eternal postulate in the counsels of the Deity, having been, indeed, the mainspring which guided and set in equable motion the wheels within wheels of the providential government of man.

In the chapter upon the New Testament doctrine of the Work of the Believer, it was said that the believer shared in the benefits of that work of Christ, amongst other benefits accruing to faith being the ability to approach the Most High without ritual restrictions and without any intercessor but Jesus, and the ability to worship God by prayer and thanksgiving and acts of self-abnegation. To assist divine worship, it was afterwards remarked, the rite of the Eucharist was instituted.

Now, in connection with these two phases of New Testament doctrine, it has been no part of our labours to enter into the perplexing theological questions as to the exact boundaries, or the efficient and instrumental causes, of so-called justification and sanctification; nor has it been any part of our plan to apportion the precise limits of what is achieved by Christ, and what by man, in the ultimate salvation of the soul; all we have had to keep steadily in view has been, not at all these controverted and exasperating questions, but the relations of these two phases of doctrine to the Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice. Interesting and consolatory as it undoubtedly is to draw the line firmly at the part performed by the death of Christ, and the part performed by the deeds of man in the remission of sins, that agreeable study has not fallen within our duty; what we have placed before ourselves to investigate, is the part assumed by Christ and that assumed by man in the presentation of sacrifice.

And, in continuing the elaboration of the Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice, it has been evident that the two New Testament doctrines above mentioned were readily translatable into sacrificial language. It was, it may be said, to render sacrifice, which had become distasteful by the intermixture of sin, again acceptable to the righteous and loving God; it was to restore the Word to His exalted priestly office, which had been contravened by the Fall; it was to render possible to man the

Paradisaic sacrificial privileges which he had forfeited, that the work of Christ was necessary. So also the results of the work of Christ may be described as being the reintroduction of interrupted sacrifices, and the reclothing human sacrifices with an atmosphere acceptable unto God. Further, the one side of the method of restoration, the death upon the cross, may be denominated the offering of an atoning life, the other side may be named the endowing human acts and feelings with sacramental efficacy. There was, in fact,—not to delay upon additional illustration,—in the New Testament doctrines of the Work of Christ and the Work of Man a wide-reaching and minute correspondence with the sacrificial provisions of the Old Testament, which rendered the latter a most convenient and vivid means for the presentation of the former.

Nor was this possibility of translation into sacrificial language, it has been further seen, founded upon a mere evanescent analogy, upon an intangible figure of speech. With all the frequency of merely figurative usage,—and it has been apparent that such a usage was very common in the New Testament,—there was also a most intimate connection everywhere latent. To a resemblance in one respect, possibly quite secondary, which amply sufficed to make a figurative employment not unsuitable and often telling, there were superadded resemblances so numerous and vital as to constitute, if not identity, at any rate a pre-ordained connection of relations. The fact is, as has now become evident, there was a most accurate correspondence in part and in whole between the sacrificial cultus of the Old Testament and the ethical economy of the New, a correspondence divinely planned and progressively revealed. The sensuous worship of the post-Paradisaic and pre-Christian times received its very validity from the more spiritual worship of the apostolic and post-apostolic periods, just as the culture of childhood has its ultimate authorization in the cultivated man. The very form which the Patriarchal and Mosaic worship assumed was dictated by the revelation yet to come; every detail of the rites of atonement by blood had its final end and initial origin in the eternally predestined surrender of Christ to death, and every detail of those ancient rites of presentation in kind had its

final end and initial origin in the surrender of body, soul, and spirit, which that death rendered possible and acceptable. By virtue of the New Testament teaching concerning the work of Christ and the work of man, the unexplained features of the previous dispensations had their predetermined and necessary explanation; by virtue of the Old Testament doctrine of Atonement and Presentation, the leading features of the New Testament dispensation have their predetermined and necessary links of connection. The biblico-theological conception of sacrifice is not complete, unless to the statement that the sacrifices of Christian believers receive an atoning and sacramental value by the one offering and the eternal priesthood of Jesus, the counter-statement be added, that the atoning and sacramental force of the sacrifices of pre-Christian times were equally due to that same offering and priesthood. It is the teaching of the New Testament that the atonement of Golgotha is potent from the Fall to the Last Judgment, and was the efficient cause of the acceptable worship of the Jew or his patriarchal ancestors as much as of the Christian. Had the Old Covenant not been followed by a New, God would have left Himself without an interpreter: had the New not been preceded by the Old, He would have left Himself without a witness.

But the New Testament not only retrojects its doctrine of Sacrifice into the past, it projects it into the future.

Itself the complement to the teaching of its predecessors, the New Testament doctrine of Sacrifice knows no complement to itself in this present world. Briefly stated, the New Testament doctrine of Sacrifice is that, by the potency of the atonement of Jesus, the believer in that atonement may present himself, as Paul puts it, a "living sacrifice, acceptable unto God;" this doctrine is nowhere regarded as transitional. Very different is the teleology of the Jewish and Christian offerings, for the Christian claims to know no supplanting until the heavens are rolled together as a scroll, when it shall be translated without seeing death. The High Priest of the Christian profession, as contradistinguished from His predecessors of the Tabernacle and the Temple, is "a priest for ever;" the atonement by means of which the Christian preacher proclaims remis-

sion of sins is "one sacrifice for sins for ever;" the boldness "to enter into the holiest by the new and living way" is commingled with no dread of a further development of the divine will; the apostle who beseeches us to give our "bodies" as "living sacrifices" has just expressed his conviction that "neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, is able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." In this respect, as in so many, the truth as it is in Jesus is pleromatic.

But the New Testament doctrine of Sacrifice is not yet wholly stated. The New Testament projects these doctrines of the Sacrifice of Christ and the Sacrifice of Man into the heavenly world. Amidst the little that is revealed of that mysterious future, of that "Sabbath that remaineth," of that "joy of the Lord," of that splendid fruition of all the upheavals and disruptions, the denudations and depositions, the retrogressions and developments of human history, the outlines of the Christian doctrine of Sacrifice are clearly discernible.

For, in the first place, if the atonement of Christ stands prominently forward in the apostolic conceptions as the one source of the devoted life of service now possible to man, the atonement of Christ is quite as truly the ultimate and eternal cause of the service of the redeemed in the world to come. This is the unanimous teaching of the apostles. Paul writes to the Romans: "Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, Who is even at the right hand of God, Who also maketh intercession for us."[1] The Apostle John speaks of "the Advocate with the Father."[2] Peter dwells exultantly upon the "glory" given to Christ which His followers shall share. Jude closes his brief Epistle with the magnificent doxology to Him Who can present us faultless before the presence of His glory. So, too, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, falling back upon the expressive symbols of the Mosaic law, boldly states the unchangeable priesthood of Christ and the eternal validity of the one atonement.[3] And, significantly enough, as prison walls fell

[1] Rom. viii. 34. [2] 1 John ii. 1.
[3] Heb. vii. 24–27, viii. 1, 2, ix. 24–26.

away and the glimpse of the Mediterranean was lost in the blaze of the wall-less heaven and the roll of the glassy sea, and the Apostle John gazed through the open door upon the things which should be hereafter as well as upon the things which were, to the azure throne girt with its rainbow before which the elders were casting their crowns as they sang, "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power: for Thou hast created all things," there succeeded the song of redemption, loud as the sea, sweet as a harmony of harps, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain." Indeed, amongst the many wonders of that book of wonders, there is no fact more patent than the prominence at all great moments of the Lamb as it had been slain; yea, in the new heavens and the new earth, there is still seen the same prominent figure. It is true that we are here in the realms of mystery; but, as Dr. Newman justly said in the sermon which was quoted at the head of this chapter, "These and similar passages (unquestionably) refer us to the rites of the Jewish law. They contain notice of the type, but what is the antitype? We can give no precise account of it. For consider, *why* was it that Christ ascended on high? With what object? What is His work? What is the meaning of His interceding for us in heaven? We know that, whatever He does, it is the gracious reality of the Mosaic figure. . . . Instead of explaining, Scripture does not continue to answer us in the language of the type; even to the last it veils His deed under the ancient figure. Shall we, therefore, explain away its language as merely figurative, which (as the word is now commonly understood) is next to saying it has no meaning at all? Far from it. . . . We will studiously keep to the figure given in Scripture; we will not attempt to interpret it, or change the wording of it, being wise above what is written. We will not neglect it, because we do not understand it. We will hold it a mystery, or (what was anciently called) a truth sacramental—that is, a high invisible grace lodged in an outward form, a precious possession to be piously and thankfully guarded for the sake of the heavenly reality contained in it."[1]

[1] *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. ii. pp. 210, 211.

The apostles also, in the second place, clearly teach that the heavenly life will be a life of uninterrupted and unsymbolic sacrifice,—a blissful restoration of the obedient service and sacred communion of Eden. The golden age of self-sacrifice is ever in the future, not in the present or the past. The very glorying of the Church in the purification by the blood of the Lamb, is that such purification has constituted its members "kings and priests."[1] To have merited the "Well done, good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful over a few things," is to be rewarded by an appointment to serve "in many things." Whenever the curtain is lifted from the unseen world, the scene witnessed is of unrestricted intercourse with God through the Son, and of unintermittent service of God through the merits of the Lamb. "And I saw no Temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the Temple of it. . . . And there shall be no more curse: but the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; and His servants shall serve Him: and they shall see His face; and His name shall be in their foreheads."[2]

In such manner, by the projection of the atonement and high-priesthood of Jesus, and of the priesthood and sacrifice of the Christian, into the heavenly world, the cycle of the scriptural doctrine of Sacrifice is completed; "Paradise Lost" has become "Paradise Regained."

[1] Rev. i. 5, 6, v. 10. [2] Rev. xxi. 22, xxii. 3, 4.

CHAPTER XII

THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE—CONCLUSION.

"Si salus quæritur, ipso nomine *Jesu* docemur, penes eum esse ; si Spiritus alia quælibet dona, in ejus unctione reperientur ; si puritas, in ejus conceptione ; si redemptio, in ejus passione ; si absolutio, in ejus damnatione ; si maledictionis remissio, in ejus cruce ; si satisfactio, in ejus sacrificio ; si purgatio, in ejus sanguine."—CALVIN, *Institutio Christianæ Religionis*, Lib. II. cap. xvi. § 19.

THE aim placed before ourselves at the outset of this long inquiry was to extract from the Scriptures their doctrine of Sacrifice. Having prepared ourselves for this journey through a largely unexplored country by taking correct bearings of the district to be traversed, and by arming ourselves with the necessary instruments, we have now successively surveyed and mapped down the salient thusiological features of what might not inappropriately be designated the Palæozoic or Patriarchal Period, the Mesozoic or Mosaic Period, and the Kainozoic or Christian Period, bestowing what glances were possible upon the fascinating Modern Period now in process of formation. Our purpose being now fulfilled, it may be useful to present a summary of the results obtained.

The scriptural doctrine of Sacrifice is the scriptural doctrine of the worship of God by the presentation of gifts; that is to say, by the presentation of that which has been of some cost to the offerer. This doctrine treats of five distinct periods, during each of which this worship by presentation possessed characteristic and instructive features both of resemblance and difference.

The first phase of the scriptural doctrine of Sacrifice was the Paradisaic. In the blissful state of their primeval creation, our first parents were able to present to God their every thought and act and feeling. Whether or not they also made

presentations to the Most High of the fruits of their divinely-instituted toil, we cannot say for certain, although, as we have seen, such a presentation would have been in harmony with all we know of the artlessness and simplicity of that life in the garden of the Lord. At any rate, that exceptional life of fearless intercourse was itself an oblation of the saintliest and most expressive kind. This first period, the period of uninterrupted sacrifice, came to an end at the Fall.

The problem which subsequent sacrifice in any form had to solve was, to render possible to man and acceptable to God that self-sacrifice which was the invariable expression of the religious life of unfallen man; in other words, to remove the obstacles to the restoration of the paradisaic state of obedience and blessedness,—those obstacles lying in the fallen nature of man and the unchangeable nature of God; man resting beneath the divine ban, and becoming daily more unable to offer an acceptable sacrifice in the absence of that divine influence withdrawn because of sin, and God, by the immaculate holiness of His ineffable Being, refusing of moral necessity to accept any sacrifice from a sinful creature. How the problem was solved by divine love, has been seen. The three succeeding phases of sacrifice were eternally prearranged and divinely revealed, in order that the paradisaic form of unreserved sacrifice might be placed once more within the reach of man. Each of these phases has its cogency in the eternal hypothesis of the atonement effected upon the cross in time; but each, whilst conveying that ultimate substantiation of its power in its peculiar form, was exquisitely adapted to impart in a manifestly increasing measure the divine truths of the forgiveness of sins and the possibility of restored communion,—that is to say, the divine truth of a possible renewal of self-sacrifice.

The second phase of the scriptural doctrine of Sacrifice was the Patriarchal. When Abel, acting upon his inward prompting, embodied in outward form, itself suggested by an extraordinary divine act, the emotions which agitated him, and presented before God his fat firstlings, his offering was graciously and unmistakably accepted, and he himself was accounted righteous not because of the intrinsic worth of his

sacrifice, but because for two reasons, viz. the motives which prompted it and its objective suggestiveness, the sacrifice became a sacrament, and conveyed to Abel the blessings of the divine favour. This primary animal sacrifice, as we have seen, having been rendered innocuous by the corrective revelation made to Abraham, became the model of the sacrificial worship of patriarchal times. Its ritual was augmented, its use was extended. On the one hand, it gave rise to a rudimentary institution of a priesthood, and of specially consecrated places for worship; it was adapted, on the other, to satisfy the manifold religious needs of man, so differently aroused and so variously directed. From the retroflected light of more modern times, it is evident that these patriarchal sacrifices were at once symbolical, typical, and sacramental; they expressed the self-sacrifice of the worshipper, they pointed the way to the atonement to be revealed in the fulness of time, they were the divinely appointed channels for the blessings of sanctification and justification, wrought by virtue of the ideally consummated death of Jesus. It is even evident from the records that in some manner these several elements of significance were apprehended by the worshippers themselves of that early time. Thus the animals they offered in sacrifice were manifestly symbolical of their personal self-surrender; their several sacrifices were as manifestly the sacramental instruments of the sense of the divine forgiveness and of the possibility of acceptable worship; and if the typical nature of the unexplained elements of animal sacrifice was not occasionally suggested to the more pious worshipper, at any rate the prophetical office of the type was recognised, and these unexplained elements were understood to foreshadow and prepare the way for further revelations. This second stage of the doctrine of Sacrifice was the first introductory stage to a better time; it had its own emphatic messages of the merciful forgiveness and approachability of God, and with those messages it awakened an expectancy of greater things to come.

The third phase of the scriptural doctrine of Sacrifice was the Mosaic. Retaining the same general features as were conspicuous in the Patriarchal Age,—repeating, in fact, the

same intellectual difficulties without any more adequately solving them,—the Mosaic doctrine, divinely given as it was, was but the patriarchal doctrine in fuller detail, and with slightly more satisfying interpretation. The comparatively undifferentiated ritual of Abel and Abraham became largely differentiated at Sinai; and after the transitional ceremonies of the Passover and the Solemn League and Covenant had prepared the way, a varied and extended system of sacrificial worship was imparted to Moses, every detail of which displayed an exquisite adaptation to the religious wants of the Israelite. Thenceforth high priest, priests, and Levites, accredited with sacred attributes and enjoying exceptional privileges, performed a minutely developed worship of purifications and sacrifices in holy places, splendidly equipped and solemnly consecrated. Thenceforth divinely appointed ministrants, at a divinely appointed spot, presided with divinely appointed rites at a divinely appointed sacrificial worship. Into the details of the legal injunctions, which have been classified and expounded in the earlier part of this work, we need not again enter. Suffice it to say that, generally regarded, the Mosaic doctrine of Sacrifice, whilst pre-eminently adapted to arouse and satisfy religious wants, was nevertheless but introductory. Its several injunctions, like the rites of the Patriarchal Age, had a symbolic, a sacramental, and a typical significance. Unlike the patriarchal rites, these Mosaic injunctions had also what has been termed an essential significance, or an express interpretation of its difficult symbolism. The Mosaic injunctions were therefore valuable, first, for the elementary truths which were divinely revealed and symbolized by them; secondly, for the spiritual satisfaction they imparted as divinely constituted sacraments; and, thirdly, for the attitude of suspense and expectation which the unexplained portions, conjointly with the express revelation of the will of God concerning the future, infallibly aroused. Then there was another point, as we have seen, besides the greater detail and clearer interpretation in which the Mosaic doctrine of Sacrifice excelled the Patriarchal, that point being the more elaborate provision made for the assimilation and development of this worship by places, persons, rites, and seasons. Thus

an instructive national history convincingly imprinted upon the national conscience the importance attached by God to this worship by blood and bloodless offerings, whilst the fervent utterances of psalmists and prophets perpetually reiterated the pleasure to be derived from the revealed system of worship, and the pain and degradation which inevitably ensued upon forgetfulness of that worship. Further, as time rolled on, revelations were vouchsafed by the mouths of prophets, which showed with increasing clearness the divine purpose in these seemingly supererogatory if not revolting rites, until at length the announcement was distinctly made, that in such a person and at such a time the problem of sacrifice, hitherto temporally solved, should be solved afresh, all provisional expedients of form or rite being thenceforth abolished. The Mosaic doctrine of Sacrifice had an ostensible reference to the religious wants of the Jewish people, and an equally ostensible reference to the times to come; it was consciously practical and consciously transitional.

Regarding, therefore, the two phases of Old Testament teaching just reviewed, so manifestly similar amidst much diversity, we see that the advance made in pre-Christian times towards the solution of the problem of sacrifice was briefly this: Man is permitted to display his self-sacrifice before God under the material form of animal and vegetable offerings. If we ask the reason of the acceptability of such offerings, the reply must be, "Such sacrifices were acceptable to God, inasmuch as they were typical and symbolical; in their symbolic and typical nature lay the roots of their sacramental validity." If the question be further asked, of what they were typical, it must be replied, that for a time their typical significance consisted in simply pointing to a revelation yet to be given for a solution of the numerous difficulties associated with these phases of sacrifice, but that at length their typical significance was seen to consist in prefiguring the atonement to be made on Golgotha. In fact, broadly and briefly stated, the Old Testament solution of the problem of sacrifice was this, that material sacrifices were acceptable to God which consisted of objects of cost and of blood, the former symbolizing the self-surrender of the offerer, the latter symbolizing the means by

which that self-surrender is made acceptable, and both typifying the atonement and the sacrifices of Christian times. The Old Testament doctrine was itself introductory, and, whilst sacramentarily powerful because of the eternal hypothesis of the atonement of Christ, it cleared the road for a more complete solution. The Canon of the Old Testament closed with exciting descriptions of the glorious revelations with which the future was pregnant, and then prophecy, having done its work, was silent for centuries.

The fourth phase of the Christian doctrine of Sacrifice was the Christian. In this the types and shadows of the past have been swallowed up in fulfilment. From a religious service which, revealed as it was, was yet symbolic, and, sacramental as it was, was yet typical, there has sprung a religious service revealed just as truly and unsymbolic, sacramental, and antitypical. Both in the matter of atonement and in the matter of presentation, there has been an apotheosis. The luminous figure of the Crucified One occupies the place of the rites of blood, and the gladsome self-surrender of disciples takes the place of the incessant presentation of flesh and fruits in all the tiresome variety of the legal offerings. It is as if the trumpet had sounded, and all had been changed in the twinkling of an eye into a more glorious life; or, to use a more matter-of-fact illustration, it is as if, the school days once ended, difficulties in method and matter of education have become clear to the thoughtful and active man. To a degree, in the change of custom, the believer in the atonement of Jesus is enabled to present himself a living sacrifice unto God as his first parents did in Eden. It is true that in one respect the symbolic form of previous eras is retained, and the atonement of Jesus is remembered in the present as it was typified in the past, but this is but an apparent exception to the change that has passed upon all; this symbolic service is an aid to worship, not an indispensable channel; and it would no more stamp the Christian epoch as similar to the Mosaic, than the presentation of material offerings by Adam and Eve in the garden bridged over the gigantic interval between the paradisaic and patriarchal states.

The fifth and last phase of the scriptural doctrine of

Sacrifice is the Heavenly. In this, the eternal priesthood of Jesus subsisting, every redeemed soul will become a priest in the everlasting temple; and in this, by the illimitable mercy of God, sin and its consequences upon sacrifice being for ever done away, man will have fought his way through the necessary clouds and darkness of the material, through the no less necessary darkness and clouds of the spiritual, to the undimmed vision and never-lapsing ministry of the unchanging world,—from the ignorant innocence of Eden right through the knowledge of good and evil to the heaven of deliberate choice. "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. . . . And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them; and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them, their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away."

And now the author takes his farewell of his patient reader with many regrets, not the least poignant of which arise from the sense of possible misguidance. Truth is like the sun in the solar system, unmoved and immoveable; those who live in its light and warmth are never motionless. Simple revolution in the lapse of time suffices to present the onlooker with new scenes. To point our instruments towards the glorious object of our search, is to arouse the exasperating thought that it is but a reflected image we see, which will vary with our position, and is possibly distorted by the atmosphere through which we peer. "What is truth indeed?" we may ask with subtle Plato as well as jesting Pilate. In itself the changeless; to us the ever-changing. Other observers, too, are at their posts watching, through what intermediate atmosphere it is hard, if not impossible, to tell; we and they roll on our ceaseless course and in our appropriate orbits; we have our days and nights, our winters and our summers, and they, we know, have theirs; to us they seem to retrograde and stand still and advance, and we to them. None the less is every tiniest

observation, by whomsoever made, of value. Observations from many sides, at many times, and from many points of view, may mutually correct each other, and one day coalesce into a beautiful harmony. Truth is fixed, and one day, after the labours of many explorers, human views of truth may themselves become immutable. And our figure reminds us that to know truth and to live by it are different things. The sun would still shoot forth its vivifying and enlightening rays, if there were no such thing as solar science; and he may rejoice in the glorious rest of the scriptural doctrine of Sacrifice, who cannot map its phases or trace its growth. Christ is still all in all, if our little systems have not their day; unreserved surrender is still possible and profitable since He has died; access into the Holiest may yet be our invariable hope through the intercession and offering of the High Priest after the order of Melchisedek. The Church of Christ on earth has its new song, if it has not its infallible theology, and nothing can rob it of its mighty hope that one day to the song of redemption, the knowledge, the invariable science, of redemption will be superadded. Till then, let the "search after truth" be our work and our reward.

Lauda Sion salvatorem,
Lauda ducem et pastorem
In hymnis et canticis;
Quantum potes, tantum aude,
Quia major omne laude,
Nec laudare sufficis.

Sit laus plena, sit sonora,
Sit jocunda, sit decora,
Phase vetus terminat.
Vetustatim novitas,
Umbram fugat veritas,
Noctem lux eliminat.

Bone pastor, panis vere,
Jesu, nostri miserere,
Tu nos pasce, nos tuere,
Tu nos bona fac videre
In terra viventium.
Tu qui cuncta scis et vales,
Qui nos pascis hic mortales,
Tu nos ibi commensales,
Coheredes et sodales
Fac sanctorum civium.

APPENDIX.

I.

ON THE HEBREW SACRIFICIAL TERMINOLOGY AND ITS HELLENISTIC EQUIVALENTS.

NOT simply to substantiate the definition of the scriptural conception of *Sacrifice* given in the introduction to this book, but to lessen difficulties which must arise at every step in our discussion if a precise use of words be not adopted by the writer and understood by the reader, it seems advisable to collect into one view once for all the terms commonly employed in Holy Scripture to designate the several varieties, classes, and attributes of sacrifice, to deduce from their etymology and usage the exact significance attached to them, and to enumerate the several English words selected as synonymous. It was the absence of some such connected view of scriptural terminology which caused the translators of the Authorized Version to miss or curtail the meaning of many an important passage in both Testaments. It is therefore proposed to examine, in the first place, the Hebrew sacrificial terms of the Old Testament, whether specific or generic, giving at the same time the English words regarded in this treatise as equivalents; and, in the second place, in prospect of the examination to be subsequently undertaken into the sacrificial language of the New Testament, to extract from the Septuagint those Greek words which were regarded by the LXX. as nearly as possible equipollent with the Hebrew.

A.—The Hebrew Sacrificial Terminology.

(1.) *The Specific Terms.*

The principal varieties of the Jewish sacrifices—not including those like the shewbread, the tithes, and the first-fruits, about which there is no possibility of difficulty either in Hebrew

or English—were known by the names of *olah, tsevach shelamim, chattath, asham, minchah,* and *nesek.*

1. *Olah* (עֹלָה) is not, as Ewald has maintained, a derivative of a root *ul* (עוּל), meaning *to glow or burn,*[1] but of a root *alah* (עָלָה), *to go up.* This word is used in Gen. xix. 28 of the ascent of smoke, and in Judg. xx. 40, Jer. xlviii. 15, of anything which when burned turns to smoke. It is also used of the passage from a lower position to a higher, such as from one nation to another, from one place to another, *e.g.* Gen. xiii. 1; Ex. i. 10; 1 Kings xii. 27. Two opinions have hence been held as to the significance of *olah,* the one tracing its use to the entire ascension of the sacrifice it signified in smoke to God; the other, to the raising of the sacrifice from the earth where it was slain to the altar-hearth where it was consumed. According to the former view, the exact significance of *olah* would be *the offering that rises to God in smoke;* according to the latter, *the offering that is lifted upon the altar.* The former opinion seems the more probable, inasmuch as it presents a tangible distinction between one kind of sacrifice and another, whereas the latter would equally apply to many Jewish sacrifices. But the etymology of the word, however interesting, is not indispensable. *Olah* is exclusively used for that variety of animal sacrifice which was completely burned upon its presentation at the altar; its synonym in Hebrew is *kalil* (כָּלִיל), or *whole-offering.* Reserving *whole-offering* for the word just mentioned, we may use as equivalents of *olah* either *burnt-offering* (the word commonly used in the Authorized Version) or *holocaust.*

2. *Tsevach shelamim* (זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים) is the singular form of that variety of sacrifices named *shelamim,* the singular form *shelem* being found but once in Amos v. 22. These *shelamim* have been very variously translated. Josephus translated the word by χαριστήριος θυσία, and he has been followed by Luther in his Bible (*Dank-opfer*), and by Reland, Gesenius, de Wette, Maur, Rosenmüller, Winer, Ewald, Knobel, Hofmann. The common equivalent in the Septuagint version of Samuel, Kings, and Proverbs is εἰρηνικὴ θυσία, which is paralleled by the Vulgate *sacrificia pacifica,* by the Authorized Version with its *peace-offerings,* and by Tholuck, Kahnis, Delitzsch, Kurtz, Oehler, with their *Friedensopfer.* In the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Chronicles, Ezekiel, the Septuagint renders this variety of sacrifice by σωτήριον; which precedent was followed by Philo, Calvin, Outram (*Sacrificia salutaria*), and by Hengstenberg, Keil, Oehler, Bunsen (*Heilsopfer*). Bähr renders by *Erstatt-*

[1] *Alterthümer,* 3rd ed., note on p. 64.

ungsopfer (restitutionary offering); Baumgarten, by *Vollendungsopfer* (consummatory offering); Ebrard, by *Bezahlungsopfer* (sacrifice in payment of debt); Neumann, by *Seligkeitsopfer* (the offering of the saved). An inspection of these various meanings reduces the main differences of interpretation to two—one class of translators, under the several names of *thank-offering, peace-offering, consummatory-offering, offering of the saved,* regarding these offerings as the sacrifices of those who are living in the sense of the divine favour; and the other class, under the names of *payment* and *restitution offering,* seeing in these offerings a method of thanking God for His mercies by the repayment of part. For each of these views derivation is pleaded. Two derivations of *shelamim* have been suggested. According to the one, the word is derived from *shalem,* the same word as *salem,* which means primarily *to be whole,* and hence *to be at peace, to have friendship* with any one: the *shelamim* would thus be sacrifices made in assurance of peace with God. The other derivation is from the *Piel* form of the same root, which signifies to *make whole,* and hence, as a secondary meaning, *to heal a breach by making some recompense;* this would make the *shelamim* sacrifices of restitution. Etymologically, the settlement of these rival hypotheses is doubtful; usage makes, however, the whole matter clear. For, first, it should be borne in mind that these offerings were not merely made upon the receipt of blessings, but sometimes before requesting some good; such a usage would seem to exclude the latter etymology. Secondly, whenever more sacrifices than one were offered, sin-offerings came first, burnt-offerings second, and peace-offerings third; if these offerings were intended to heal a breach by recompense, they should be presented first, and not last. Thirdly, the peculiarity of the ritual is decisive; it is not the *sprinkling of blood* or the *presentation* that is emphasized, but the *concluding meal* to which God has invited His servants as His guests. Postponing, then, for the present, the examination of the word *tsevach,* which in its present connection simply expresses the singular number, it may be stated that, in accordance with their essential meaning, the *shelamim* may be always translated, as in the Authorized Version, by *peace-offerings.*

Three varieties of the *shelamim* call for passing notice—viz., the *tsevach nedhabhah* (זֶבַח נְדָבָה), exactly rendered by *free-will* or *voluntary peace-offering;* the *tsevach nedher* (זֶבַח נֶדֶר), or *votive peace-offering;* and the *tsevach-al-todhoh* (זֶבַח עַל־תּוֹדָה or זֶבַח הַתּוֹדָה), or *peace-offerings of thanks, todhoh* being from Hiphil of root *yadhah, to cause to throw, to raise,* more restrictedly, *to*

raise the hand, and hence *to give thanks*. There will be no fear of confusion if these varieties are called *voluntary*, *votive*, and *thank* offerings.

3. *Chattath* (חַטָּאת), from a root meaning *to miss a mark*, as an archer does, or *to make a false step*, is the Hebrew word for a *sin*; occasionally it signifies not a concrete and single act, but the abstract *sinfulness*. As a secondary meaning, it is used for that variety of sacrifice which is rendered in the Authorized Version *sin-offering*, and this synonym may be retained. It is necessary to remember, however, that the word is applied in the Old Testament to sacrifices of the same essential significance, but of very different character in detail. Thus it is used of the sin-offering of individuals, whether of the priesthood, of the government, or of the ranks of the people (see Lev. iv. and v., *passim*), and whether they were offered for an unintentional breach of one of the commandments, for such offences as withholding the whole truth in a court of law, for an involuntary infringement of the laws of purification, or for breaking an oath. It is also used for offerings commanded to remove uncleanness (see Lev. xiv. 22, xv. 15, 30), for the goat which was slaughtered on the Day of Atonement (Lev. xvi. 3, 5), for the bullock killed at the consecration of Aaron (Lev. viii. 2), and for the calf and kid immolated at the consecration of the Tabernacle (Lev. ix. 2, 3); whilst the offerings made at the monthly and festal celebrations are also designated sin-offerings (see Num. xxviii. and xxix., *passim*). Nevertheless, it is not difficult to see the common element which underlies all these cases. As the *shelamim* were offerings made in and for the sense of the divine communion, although they were presented now as votive and now as voluntary and now as thank-offerings, so the *sin-offerings*, under all their variety of form, were brought to the Most High to obtain the sense of the divine forgiveness.

4. *Asham* (אָשָׁם), from a root signifying *negligence in gait*, and also, by an ethical application of the same idea, *failure in duty*, stands primarily for *guilt*, and secondarily for a *sacrifice for guilt*. Its use, like that of *chattath*, is, however, considerably more limited, and may be tolerably well conveyed by the synonym employed by the Authorized Version, viz. *trespass-offering*. The very name of this variety of sacrifice shows that it must be nearly allied to the *chattath*, and some have not hesitated to say that they are, as their names etymologically are, identical. Much difficulty has been found in defining the exact distinction between the trespass and sin offerings. Indeed, as Kurtz[1] has said: "In the whole province of Biblical

[1] *Alttest. Opfercultus*, § 93.

Theology, there is scarcely a question to be found, the answer to which has given rise to so much loose thinking as this, and at the correct solution of which Biblical Science has arrived so late, although the data for that solution are clearly to hand in the Bible." Some have said the difference is merely verbal, others have pronounced it arbitrary and incomprehensible; others have found in the sin-offerings sacrifices for unintentional wrong-doing, and in the trespass-offerings sacrifices for sins that were deliberate; and others, again, have recognised in each sacrifices for the atonement of sins, the former of omission, and the latter of commission. Nor were the Rabbis themselves agreed upon the point, for some regarded sin-offerings as enjoined for sins of ignorance, and trespass-offerings for sins of negligence; others saw in these a satisfaction for manifest transgression, and in those a satisfaction for doubtful transgression.[1] It was the investigations of Riehm and Rink which first dispelled the confusion which reigned over this subject. Now, as Fairbairn has shrewedly said in his *Typology*,[2] "the difficulty, if not altogether caused, has been very much increased, by the mistake of supposing the directions regarding the trespass-offerings to begin with chap. v. (in Lev.), whereas they really commence with the new section at ver, 14, where, as usual, the new subject is introduced with the words: 'The Lord spake unto Moses, saying.' These words do not occur at the beginning of the chapter itself; the section to the end of the 13th verse was added to the preceding chapter regarding the sin-offering, with the view of specifying certain occasions on which it should be presented, and making provision for a cheaper sort of sacrifices for persons in destitute circumstances. But in each case the sacrifice itself, without exception, is called a sin-offering (vers. 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12). In one verse, indeed (the 6th), it is said in our version: 'And he shall bring his trespass-offering;' but this is a mere mistranslation, and should have been rendered as it is in the very next verse, where the expression in the original is the same: 'And he shall bring for (or as) his trespass.'" An induction of the several instances in which *ashamim* were enjoined will make the significance clear. In the primary law of Leviticus three classes of sin are mentioned as requiring trespass-offerings, two of which concern the relation between God and man, and one the relation between man and his neighbour; these three classes of sin are: any unintentional negligence in presenting

[1] Those who would like to know more of these opinions may refer to Knobel, *Leviticus*, pp. 396, 397; and Wangemann, vol. i. pp. 307–312.

[2] Vol. ii. pp. 343, 344.

the various gifts prescribed by the Law; any unintentional infringement of a divine command; and certain deceitful violations of the rights of property, such as the unlawful detention of things committed to a man in trust, or the deceitful application of the principle, "finding is keeping." From these instances, it would appear that trespass-offerings were enjoined in all cases where the sins which had been committed allowed of restitution in kind. This inference is borne out by the peculiarity of the ritual which constituted the act of monetary redemption the most prominent feature, and by the other instances subsequently mentioned, in which trespass-offerings were presented by divine command, as in the case of the Nazarite who had broken his vow (Num. vi. 12), and the convalescent leper (Lev. xiv. 12); for the Nazarite, according to the stipulation, had broken his vow without intent, and a trespass-offering was to be brought as for the unintentional infringement of a divine command. With respect to the leper, the trespass-offering was still offered in atonement for infringement; for leprosy was everywhere regarded by Mosaism as a punishment for the breach of some commandment, and it was peculiarly fitting that when punishment was removed restitution should be made. So also the case mentioned in Lev. xix. 20, 22, is a manifest infringement of the rights of property. Trespass-offerings were therefore sacrifices for sins which admitted of valuation and recompense.

5. Postponing for a few lines the analysis of *minchah* (מִנְחָה), let it suffice to say in this place, that, in its most limited application, it is used for that variety of sacrifice which consisted of meal, cooked or uncooked, and might be fittingly translated by *meal-offering* or *bread-offering*. In the Authorized Version it is invariably rendered by *meat-offering*, a seeming misnomer to modern ears, accustomed as they are to associate the idea of animal flesh with *meat*, but easily explained by the Old English usage, according to which, just as the word *bread* is used in the phrase, "to take one's bread out of one's mouth," to signify any variety of food, speakers of three centuries ago used *meat* to express the same idea of any kind of food (compare Hab. iii. 17 and John iv. 32, 34). With this explanation we shall not err, seeing the great difficulty of changing names which have become technical, if we use the words *meat-offering* and *meal-offering* as synonyms.

6. *Nesek* (נֶסֶךְ), from a root *to pour out*, is used for something which is poured out in honour of any one, and hence for a *libation;* which word may be employed for it as well as that commonly used in the Authorized Version, viz. *drink-offering*.

(2.) *The Generic Terms.*

We now proceed to the Hebrew generic terms, a more important inquiry.

1. The first word which calls for examination is *minchah* (מִנְחָה), one meaning of which has just been stated. *Minchah*, from a root *manach, to give*, is used in a variety of senses, each, however, being perfectly clear from the context, and having the same fundamental idea. It is sometimes employed, as we have seen, to designate the *meal-* or *meat*-offering of Leviticus,—*e.g.* Lev. ii., *passim.* Sometimes it has a slightly wider significance, and stands for *bloodless* as opposed to *blood* sacrifices,—*e.g.* Ps. xl. 7; Isa. xix. 21; Dan. ix. 27. Occasionally a blood sacrifice, such as the morning or evening offering of a lamb, is intended,—*e.g.* 1 Kings xviii. 29; 2 Kings iii. 20; Ps. cxii. 2; Dan. ix. 21. More generally still, it is used for any sacrificial gift,—*e.g.* Gen. iv. 3–5; 1 Sam. xxvi. 19; 1 Chron. xvi. 29; Mal. i. 10. *Minchah* is even used for any gift from man to man, as well as from man to God,—*e.g.* Gen. xxxii. 13; 2 Sam. viii. 6; 2 Kings viii. 8. A comparison of these several applications of the word shows that the radical meaning is never lost, but that it invariably signifies *a gift to God, in which the idea of giving or presentation, and nothing else, is prominent.* Thus the *meal-offering*, as we shall afterwards see, was that Levitical sacrifice which expressed not atonement nor compensation nor self-surrender, but presentation, the act of giving at all. So of the bloodless sacrifices generally, which were made not in atonement for sin, but when atonement had been effected by other means. So of the daily sacrifices, it was the fact of their presentation itself which was especially important. As synonyms for the most limited usage of the word, the words *bread-offering, meal-offering,* or *meat-offering* may be employed; for the synonym of *minchah*, when opposed to sacrifices of atonement, *bloodless sacrifices* will suffice; and for the more general meanings of the word, *sacrifice, offering, oblation, presentation* may be used indiscriminately. Let it be noticed in passing, that *minchah* in its widest sacrificial application summarizes all varieties of sacrifices, animal or non-animal, atoning or eucharistic, and, in that case, is exactly rendered by *a gift to God.*

2. The next generic term is *tsevach* (זֶבַח), which will require careful investigation from the inadequacy and confusion of the meanings commonly assigned in Lexicons, in the Authorized Version, in the Revised Version, and in works upon the Levitical sacrifices. *Tsevach* is from a root *tsavach, to slaughter*,

especially (as Oehler has pointed out[1]) to slaughter *for food*. Hence this same root is employed to express the idea of slaying those sacrifices, part of the ceremonial of which, as in the Passover and peace-offering, consisted of a sacrificial feast. On the surface, it would thus seem that *tsevach* might be adequately rendered either by *flesh food*, or, when applied to sacrifices, since *meat-offerings* would arouse erroneous associations, by *festal-offerings*. Now, in gathering together instances of the various usages of *tsevach* from the Old Testament, it is seen that there are numerous passages where its significance is equivocal, and must be determined by the usage elsewhere; such passages it is unnecessary to enumerate. A common employment of the word is, as we have already seen, to express the singular form of the *shelamim* and its varieties; in Josh. xxii. 27, however, *tsevach* evidently means something different from *peace-offerings*, and hence it is no cause for surprise that, in 2 Chron. xxix. 31, *tsevochim* are distinguished from *thank-offerings*. In a large number of passages *tsevach* is opposed to *olah*, as if they constituted together a well-defined class of sacrifices, which might be conveyed in English by some such phrase as "holocausts and merocausts," or "whole and part burnt-offerings." Often *tsevach* clearly stands for a sacrifice which culminates in a sacrificial meal,—*e.g.* Num. xxv. 2; Deut. xii. 27; 1 Sam. ii. 13; Ezek. xlvi. 24; Hos. ix. 4. Quite as often it as clearly stands for any variety of animal sacrifice,—*e.g.*, 2 Chron. vii. 12; Ps. li. 17, 19; Prov. xv. 8; Eccles. v. 1; Isa. i. 11; Hos. iii. 4; and in the common phrase, *tsevach uminchah*. In the former case, it is equivalent to *festal-offering;* and in the latter, to *blood-sacrifice*. It would thus appear that we are confronted by a variety of irreconcilable meanings. Careful analysis will show such an opinion to be premature. There are in reality but two distinct significations—the one directly associated with the etymology, and the other an expansion of that meaning. The more common meaning of *tsevach is an animal sacrifice, part of which was subsequently eaten by the offerer;* this may be briefly rendered by *festal-offering*. It is this signification which is the key to unlock most of the various uses previously catalogued; for, inasmuch as the peace-offerings and thank-offerings were but varieties of the festal-offerings, the contrast with those sacrifices before mentioned is explained; and inasmuch as festal-offerings were partly given to God in fire and partly consumed by man, the usage with *olah* is also explained; nor could anything be more accordant with universal language than that such a generic word as *tsevach* should be made use of to express

[1] Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, vol. x. p. 627.

the singular form of a specific plural like *shelamim*. The only other class of cases where *tsevach* is found, is where it stands for animal or blood sacrifices generally; this usage is to be relegated to the list of examples where, part of the connotation falling into abeyance, words become in the natural course of things wider in meaning. Here, let it be added, how great a misfortune it is that Dr. Murphy, in his Carey Lecture for 1888 on *Sacrifice as set forth in Scripture*, has missed much of the Biblical teaching by regarding *tsevach* as the generic term for sacrifice in general.

3. *Ishsheh* (אִשֶּׁה) is a generic word of wider application than the preceding, being a legal designation for every altar sacrifice, whether animal or bloodless. It is placed in connection with the burnt-offerings,—*e.g.* Ex. xxix. 18, Lev. viii. 28; with the peace-offering, Lev. iii. 3, xxii. 22; with the sin-offering, Lev. iv. 35, v. 12; with the trespass-offering, Lev. vii. 5; with the meat-offering, Lev. xxiii. 13; with the drink-offering, Lev. xxiii. 13, Num. xv. 10; and with animal sacrifices generally, Lev. xxii. 27. The etymology is simple—from *esh, fire;* the word thus signifies *an offering made by fire.* Such a signification will apply to all cases of its occurrence, it being understood that the offerings so designated were some wholly and some partially consumed. Gesenius endeavoured to prove that *ishsheh* was also used of offerings which did not come upon the altar fire at all; but the only instance he adduced was that of the incense which accompanied the shewbread, *e.g.* Lev. xxiv. 7–9; an insufficient proof, for, even in the absence of express commands, the unvarying meaning of *ishsheh* in other places constitutes quite proof enough that when the shewbread was removed this very incense was burnt upon the golden altar; besides, Josephus expressly states that this incense was so burnt (*Antiq.* iii. x. 7), and on such a point change would scarcely have been introduced into the Mosaic Law. The equivalent of the word hereafter adopted is either *fire-offering*, or, as in the Authorized Version, *offering made by fire.* That the altar fire was originally of divine origin, and that this fire was the visible means by which each sacrifice was made to rise towards heaven, seem to imply that the generic word laid stress not upon the fact of sacrifice, but upon the person to whom sacrifice was made; in other words, the calling a sacrifice *ishsheh* pointed to the fact that it was a presentation *to God.*

4. We now advance to that generic term which was the most precise and technical of all, *qorban* (קָרְבָּן). This word is used in the Law and elsewhere to describe the genus of which animal, vegetable, and mineral sacrifices of all kinds were species. It is applied to the burnt-offering, Lev. i. 10, 14; to

the peace-offering, Lev. iii. 1, 2, etc.; to the thank-offering and votive-offering, Lev. vii. 13, xxvii. 9, 11; to the sin-offering, Lev. iv. 23, 28; to the trespass-offering, Lev. vii. 38; to the meal-offering, Lev. vii. 14; to the Passover, Num. ix. 7, 13; to the sacrifice of the Nazarite, Num. vi. 14; to all public sacrifices, Num. xxviii. 2; to the first-fruits (under the Aramaic form of the word), Neh. x. 35; and even to offerings made of spoils, Num. xxxi. 50; in short, *qorban* is the word which expresses what every form of sacrifice shared in common. Now *qorban* is from a root *qorav*, or *qorev*, meaning *to approach, come near to*, and hence, by a more limited application of the general idea, *to approach God;* a verb which is used of the ministry of the priesthood in the Holy Place,—*e.g.* Ex. xl. 32, Lev. ix. 7, xvi. 1, xxi. 17, xxii. 3; and of the approach of the people to the sanctuary by means of sacrifice, Lev. xvii. 5. From this radical significance, it is not far to the meaning in the case of a derivative noun, *that by which approach is made:* in other words, remembering the express words by which the Pentateuch conditioned divine approach: "They shall not appear before me empty" (Ex. xxiii. 15, xxxiv. 20; Deut. xvi. 16); indeed, bearing in mind the cardinal principle of scriptural sacrifices,—the worship by presentation,—it is not far to the signification of *a gift to God.* But we are not left to conjecture or to philological analogy, nor even to inference, for we have conclusive biblical evidence that such was the common acceptation of the word; in the seventh chapter of Mark the very word is used and translated by the unequivocal Greek word δῶρον: Ἐὰν εἴπῃ ἄνθρωπος τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρί· κορβᾶν, ὅ ἐστιν δῶρον, ὃ ἐὰν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφεληθῇς (Mark vii. 11). This κορβᾶν, ὅ ἐστιν δῶρον, must settle the meaning once for all of the Hebrew *qorban. Qorban* is a gift made in the service of God, *a gift to God.*

(3.) *The Attributive Terms.*

There still remain to be considered a few sacrificial terms of frequent use in the Old Testament.

1. First and foremost comes that most important word *kipper* (כִּפֶּר), variously translated in the Authorized Version by *make atonement, purge, purge away, reconcile, make reconciliation, pacify, pardon, be merciful,* and *put off,* upon the right understanding of which so large a portion of the Old Testament doctrine of Sacrifice depends. The value and indispensableness of a precise connotation must be our only apology for an exhaustive study, as far as lexicography can assist, of this much used and much abused word. We propose to consider, first, its

several forms; secondly, its several grammatical constructions; thirdly, its etymology; and, lastly, its usage, each as bearing upon the point at issue, and by such an examination to define the precise scriptural significance of the term. The forms under which the root *kaphar* appears are not numerous. In Kal it is found but once; and even in that instance doubts have been expressed by Fürst as to whether the word is not from an entirely different root, a denominative of *kopher* (*asphalt*). A Nithpael and a Hithpael form are each found once. There is also a nominal derivative in *kopher*. The usual verbal forms are, however, the Piel and Pual. Turning to the etymology of the root, it is happily the case that no doubt has been expressed upon this head, the cognate dialects giving unanimous and unquestionable testimony that the root signifies *to cover*. The Piel form might thus be expected to give an intensive form of the same idea. Much interest centres in the various constructions under which the Piel form of *kipper* is grammatically employed. Sometimes it is followed by a simple objective case, signifying *the covering* "of iniquity" (Ps. lxxiii. 38; Dan. ix. 24), "of the face of an enemy" (Gen. xxxii. 21), "of the land of promise" (Deut. xxxii. 43), "of the holy place," or "of the house of Aaron." According to the more usual construction, however, the thing or person *covered* is expressed by the preposition *al* (עַל) and its consequent case; as in such instances as the following: *to throw a covering* "over her" (Lev. iv. 20), "over him" (Lev. iv. 35), "over them" (Lev. iv. 20), "over himself," "over the people," "over the children of Israel," etc., "over sins" (Ps. lxxix. 9), "over iniquity" (Jer. xviii. 2), "over the sins which he hath sinned" (Lev. v. 18), "over souls" (Ex. xxx. 16), "over the horns of the altar" (Ex. xxx. 10); sometimes, and not infrequently, the preposition *baadh* (בַּעַד) is used to express the same idea more completely, as in the phrases, *to throw a covering round* one's sin, *round* one's house, *round* the congregation. That by which the *covering* was effected was commonly conveyed by the preposition *b^e* (בְּ), and sometimes by the preposition *min* (מִן); as, for example, in the phrases, *to cover anything or anybody over* "by blood" (Ex. xxx. 10), "by a sin-offering" (Lev. iv. 26), "by a ram," "by mercy and truth" (Prov. xvi. 6). The place where the *covering* was effected is also designated by the preposition *b^e* (בְּ), as in the phrase *baqqodesh*—in the holy place. The person from whom *covering* was made was signified by the preposition *l^e* (לְ),—*e.g. to cover up* "from the face of the Lord" (Lev. v. 26 (Heb.), vi. 7 (A. V.)), "from Thy people" (Deut.

xxi. 8). In addition to these general statements, an examination of the grammatical structure, side by side with an examination of the usage (which we may conveniently anticipate), shows that the *covering of a person* means the *covering* of *his sin;* compare, for example, such a phrase as this, "And the priest shall throw a covering over him, *over the sin which he hath sinned*" (Lev. iv. 35,[1] or v. 13). The full construction of *kipper* would thus seem to be, "to throw a covering over a man, that is to say, over his sin, *from* the face of God *by means of* a sacrifice *presented in* a holy place." The construction thus suggests that the process of *covering* was *some method of concealing or neutralizing sin that it should not offend the Deity.* But what says the common usage of the word, as determined from the various contexts, to the significance of this technical *covering?* It has been suggested that "to cover" means in sacrifice *to render invisible;* another suggestion is, that it is *to protect from danger;* whilst yet a third opinion considers that it is *to remove the power of the divine anger.* Which of these opinions does the usage of the Old Testament show to be correct? or is it possible that the Old Testament gives instances of each? It will be readily seen that neither the view that *kipper* signifies a *hiding from view,* nor the view that it signifies a *shielding from danger,* will explain the majority of scriptural connections. It is true that the former is seemingly substantiated by Jer. xviii. 23, where "to cover iniquity" is paralleled by "blotting from sight;" and the latter by Deut. xxxii. 43, "He will cover His land," where the prospect held out apparently is of a God Who will shield His people. But it must not be overlooked that a meaning to be presently stated is equally applicable to both these passages, and that meaning, as we shall presently show, is almost universal in those passages where the context can render aid. When Gesenius and others maintained that Isa. xxviii. 18, confessedly a difficult and abnormal passage, countenances this notion of "rendering invisible," the reply is simple, as Kurtz has shown, viz. that Isaiah meant not that the covenant with death should be rendered invisible, since, although invisible, it might be operative. And palpably this passage is no gain to the view that the word signifies protection from danger; for, so far from saying that the covenant with

[1] The author, of course, refers to the Hebrew, and not the English version. He has not deemed it necessary to refer to the numerous lapses of the English translators. An egregious instance occurs in Lev. v. 10, where the Authorized Version runs: "And the priest shall make an atonement for him *for his sins which he hath sinned,*" which should run, "*with his sin-offering which he hath offered.*" The reading of the A. V. cannot be held for a moment, if it be compared with the manner of rendering of Lev. iv. 35 and v. 13.

death shall be protected from danger, he asserts the opposite, that it shall be utterly destroyed. Proceeding to a more detailed examination, it needs scarcely be said that there are, of course, very many passages which cannot render any assistance at all to the special inquiry; still it is necessary to study with extreme care any case in which the context renders the slightest assistance to the comprehension of the usual significance of the word before us. Now, such a study undoubtedly favours the view that the conception conveyed by *kipper* was this,—*a covering of such a kind as to render the divine anger inoperative.* A variety of passages rise to mind. Take, for example, Ps. lxxviii. 38: "But He, being full of compassion, *covered* their iniquity, and destroyed them not: yea, many a time turned He His anger away, and did not stir up all His wrath," where, in the first half of the verse, the covering of iniquity is manifestly the preliminary to withholding destruction, and, in the second half, the parallelism of thought demands that the equivalent to the *covering iniquity* should be the *turning away of anger;* in this case, therefore, the *covering* iniquity would seem to be the interposing of something which should remove the power of sin to arouse the divine wrath. Again, in Deut. xxi. 8: "Cover Thy people Israel, O Lord, and lay not innocent blood unto Thy people of Israel's charge. And the blood shall be forgiven them," the prayer to be uttered by the elders evidently is, that the divine mercy should be so displayed in answer to their united deed, that the blood of the murdered man should no longer cry for vengeance; here, again, the covering besought is such as would render the divine retributive anger inoperative. So in Prov. xvi. 14, when it is said: "The wrath of a king is as messengers of death: but a wise man will cover it," the meaning clearly is, that a wise man will so neutralize the royal anger by his tact and sagacity that no messenger of death shall go forth. Further, when Elihu says (Job xxxvi. 18): "Because there is wrath, beware lest He take thee away with His stroke: then a great *covering* cannot release thee," his argument unquestionably is, that the very existence of the divine anger at human sin should inspire caution, lest its punitive power should be experienced; and the implication is also unquestionably that, if the stroke of the divine wrath has not already fallen, a *covering* may prevent its descent. In Gen. xxxii. 21, Jacob solaces himself, on the despatch of each contingent of cattle, with the thought: "I will *cover* his face with the present that precedeth me, and will afterwards see his face; peradventure he will accept of me;" here, again, the same significance is seen. Then, in the Korahitic rebellion, when wrath was already gone forth

from the Lord, and the plague was begun, Aaron was despatched by Moses with a censer to *cover* the people,—in other words, to avert the punishment that was descending (see Num. xvi. 46; compare Num. viii. 19 and xvii. 11). In fact, it is this conception of neutralizing and rendering inoperative the punitive wrath of God that everywhere underlies the scriptural use of *kipper*, with one exception, the passage previously quoted, Isa. xxviii. 18: "Your covenant with death shall be covered," where, instead of the significance of neutralizing the divine anger, a secondary sense would seem to be intended. Commonly, as we have seen, *kipper* signifies *to render the divine anger inoperative*, and so *to abolish it;* in this instance, as is so commonly seen in language, the limitation falls out of notice, and *kipper* signifies *to abolish* simply. Let it be noted that the effect ascribed to *kipper* is either *forgiveness of sins* (Lev. iv. 28, 31, 35, v. 10, 13, 16, 18, 26; Num. xv. 28, etc.), or *removal of uncleanness*, e.g. Lev. xii. 7, 8.

2. It may be well to mention the verbs *gaal* (גָּאַל) and *padhah* (פָּדָה), and their several substantive forms, which, in their sacrificial connections, we have invariably translated by *redeem* or *ransom*, or their derivatives. Both these verbs appear from their usage, as well as etymology, to signify primarily *to release*, as from *subjection, adversity, iniquity;* and, secondarily, the sacrificial sense, *to release by the payment of an equivalent value.* "To redeem" was to obtain release by the presentation of an equivalent gift; a "redemption" was the release so obtained, and sometimes the gift by which release was obtained.

B.—The Hellenistic Equivalents of the Hebrew Sacrificial Terminology.

Having now completed our survey of the Hebrew sacrificial terminology, it behoves us, in order to obtain a basis for the comparison of the sacrificial language of the New Testament with that of the Old, to ascertain what Greek words were considered by the translators of the Septuagint as equivalent to the Hebrew, and thus build up a sacred Greek terminology. Now, immediately we open the Septuagint, it is evident how difficult a task in this respect was that of the interpreters. Language applied with a minute exactitude to the ritual of a monotheistic and exclusive faith was to be rendered by a phraseology, the whole associations of which were, with an utterly alien faith, at once polytheistic and heathenish. To

convey the injunctions of the ceremonial worship of Jehovah, the only words eligible had been used for ages in connection with the rites and temples of Chronos and Dionysos, Zeus and Aphrodite! The inevitable result followed. There was a loss of precision, and a consequent confusion of ideas which were perfectly distinct in the Hebrew mind. Leaving out of the question the heathen notions of expiation and sacrifice which the Greek words, from their literary and popular employment, would inevitably suggest, the Septuagint bears abundant witness to this loss of precision. Κάρπωμα, originally signifying, for example, the fruits which were offered to Demeter at the Eleusinia or Thesmophora, has come in the Septuagint to stand now for a *fire-offering*, and now for a *holocaust*. Δῶρον, which Homer could employ to describe the offering Hecuba bore to Athene, does duty for *minchah*, *qorban*, *nedher*, and *todhor*. Θυσία is the synonym sometimes of *festal-offering*, sometimes of *burnt-offering*, sometimes of *fire-offering*, and sometimes of *offering* in general. Perhaps the most vivid sense of the almost insuperable difficulty under which a Greek translator laboured, will be given by a perusal on the part of the reader of the extant translations from the Hebrew of Symmachus, Theodotion, and Aquila, which, since the laborious restoration from the quotations of Patristic writers effected by Montfaucon, may be seen side by side with the Septuagint in Origen's *Hexapla*. Nevertheless, instead of showing astonishment and regret at the laxity of the Greek version, we ought rather to be amazed that, by means of the devices open to translators,—by paraphrase, by coining new words, by the adaptation of words already in use, which are etymologically similar or similar by custom, by giving as equivalents words of wider or more restricted meaning,—the Seventy contrived to render as well as they did the sacrificial language of the Pentateuch. The difficulty of translation has been strongly insisted on, because *mutatis mutandis* a parallel difficulty is met with in any English translation.

For the sake of expediting and facilitating our subsequent progress, a bird's-eye view of the sacrificial terminology of the Septuagint is appended.

1. *Olah*, *burnt-offering or holocaust*, is variously translated. Its common equivalents are words expressly coined for the purpose by composition with ὅλος,—viz. ὁλοκαύτωμα, ὁλοκαύτωσις, ὁλοκάρπωμα, and ὁλοκάρπωσις. On the principle of rendering a specific by a generic word, κάρπωμα, κάρπωσις, and θυσία are occasionally used. By an adaptation of a word which never has such a meaning in classical Greek, *olah* is once rendered by ἀναφορά (Ps. l. 21).

2. *Shelamim, peace-offering,* is rendered paraphrastically by means of σωτήριον in some connection, such as θῦμα σωτήριον, θυσία σωτήριου, θυσία αἴνεσεως σωτήριου, and τελείωσις τοῦ σωτήριου. Once it is rendered by σωτήριον alone. Trommius, in his *Concordantiæ in Septuaginta Interpretes,* gives ὁλοκαύτωμα σωτήριου as thrice occurring; but, apart from the *à priori* improbability of such a reading, recent manuscript investigations have shown these readings of the *Codex Alexandrinus* to be erroneous. The varieties of *shelamim* are rendered by θυσία αἴνεσεως, εὐχή, and ἑκούσιον.

3. *Chattath, sin-offering,* is once rendered by ἅγνισμα, once by ἐξιλασμός, once by ἁμάρτημα, twice by ἁγνισμός, but commonly, adapting the Hebrew idiom to the Greek, by ἁμαρτία.

4. *Asham, trespass-offering,* becomes, by substituting a more generic idea, ἱλασμός and καθαρισμός, each once. It is occasionally given by paraphrase as τὰ περὶ (or ὑπὲρ) ἄγνοιας, and τὸ τῆς βάσανος. By mistranslation or confusion of ideas, *asham* is twice rendered by ἁμαρτία, the other two cases mentioned by Trommius being erroneous references, due to his oversight of the manifest inversion of phrase. Commonly, after the Hebrew analogy, *asham* is rendered by πλημμέλεια, and hence twice by πλημμέλημα, and once by πλημμέλησις.

5. *Minchah* has a variety of synonyms, the translators apparently thinking it advisable to particularize its several meanings. For *meal-offering* they used θυσία σεμίδαλεως, and sometimes σεμίδαλις alone; or, neglecting the differentia altogether, they used θυσία, θυσίασμα, or that singular adoption from the Hebrew word itself, μαναά. For *Minchah, bloodless sacrifices,* the common word is θυσία; and, in books later than the Pentateuch, μαναά occasionally: once προσφορά is used. Θυσία is also the adopted equivalent of *minchah* when it signifies blood-sacrifice. *Minchah* in its most general sacrificial sense is rendered by θυσία or δῶρον; and in its signification of *gift from man to man,* by δῶρον, sometimes also by ξένιον and μαναά. It is noteworthy that the phrase *tsevach uminchah,* which in Hebrew is a summary for sacrifices of all kinds, is translated in Isa. xix. 20 by the single word θυσία.

6. *Nesek* is invariably σπονδή.

7. *Ishshch* seems to have given some trouble. Its common synonym is κάρπωμα, and once κάρπωσις. Nine times it is translated by θυσία and once by θυσίασμα. In isolated passages it is paraphrased by τὰ θυσιαζομένα, πάντα τοῦ πυρὸς (οἱ ἄρτοι) προκείμενοι. By the adaptation of a word of narrower import, *ishsheh* becomes ὁλοκαύτωμα.

8. *Qorban* is δῶρον with one exception, when it is rendered by the verbal form δωρεῖται.

9. *Kipper* is once rendered by ἀθωόω, once by ἀφίημι, and once by ἵλεως γίνομαι. By a limitation of idea, it is once translated by ἐγκαθαρίζω, once by καθαρίζω, once by καθαρὸς γίνομαι, and once by περικαθαρίζω. By an enlargement of idea it is twice rendered by ἀφαιρέω and ἁγιάζω respectively. Thrice ἱλάσκομαι is found as its synonym. But the common and frequent equivalent is ἐξιλάομαι.

Kopher is rendered once by περικάθαρμα, once by ἐξίλασμα, twice by ἄλλαγμα, and the remaining times by λύτρον.

10. The various forms of *gaal* and *padhah* are rendered by λυτρόω mostly, the substantive form being λύτρον, and occasionally λύτρωσις.

II.

ON AZAZEL.

In connection with the rites of the Day of Atonement, it is said in the choice of the two goats that they were to be presented before the door of the Tabernacle, and that Aaron was to "give lots over them . . . one lot for Jehovah, and the other lot for *Azazel*." It has been a matter of considerable controversy what is the significance of this word *Azazel*, which occurs only four times in the Old Testament, and always in connection with the ceremony of the Day of Atonement; nor can it be said that any tolerable unanimity of opinion has been arrived at. The author does not pretend to resolve the question, but simply to give a brief summary of the considerable mass of investigations relating to the subject. And even this he does not do *de novo*. In Fairbairn's *Typology*, Appendix II. in the second volume, so able and clear an abstract of previous investigations has been given, that the author recapitulates this abstract, adding however, in brackets, any further remarks he desires to make.

"The term *Azazel*," says Fairbairn, "which is four times used in connection with the ceremony of the Day of Atonement, and nowhere else, is still a matter of controversy, and its exact and determinate import is not to be pronounced on with certainty."

"1. One of the earliest opinions prevalent upon the subject regards it as the name of the goat himself: Symmachus, τράγος ἀπερχόμενος; Aquila, τράγος ἀπολελυμμένος; Vulg. *hircus emis-*

sarius; so also Theodoret, Cyril, Luther, Heine, Vater, [Bauer, Calov, Godwyn,] and the English translators, *scapegoat.* When taken in this sense, it is understood to be compounded of *az* (עז), *a goat*, and *azal* (אזל), *to send away.* The chief objections are, that *az* never occurs as a name for a buck or he-goat (in the plural it is used as a general designation for *goats*, but in the singular occurs elsewhere only as a name for a she-goat), and that in Lev. xvi. 10 and 26, Azazel is expressly distinguished from the goat, the one being said to be *for* the other. For these reasons, this view is now almost entirely abandoned." [It should be added, however, that this view, which has so many weighty authorities in its favour, has been revived of late years by one of the greatest authorities upon Old Testament theology, Hofmann, who would translate the word in his *Schriftbeweis* by *Fernling.* The one great objection, that *Azazel* is distinguished from the goat, since *the goat* would thus seem to be described as *for the goat*, Hofmann puts aside by the very pertinent remark that it is *the lot* and not *the goat* which is described in Leviticus as being *for* Jehovah and *for* Azazel. There is no contradiction, whatever improbable conjunction there may be, in saying, as the Authorized Version, for example, says, "one lot for the Lord, and the other lot for the scapegoat."]

"2. It is the name of a place, either a precipitous mountain in the wilderness to which the goat was led, and from which he was thrown headlong, or a lonely region where he was left: so Pseudo-Jonathan, Abenezra, Jarchi, Bochart, Deyling, Reland, Carpzov, [Vatablus, Lund, Clericus, Jahn]. The chief objection to this view is, that it does not seem to accord with what is said in verse 10: 'To let him go for Azazel into the wilderness,' which would then mean, 'for a desert place into a desert place.'"

"3. It is the name of Satan or an evil spirit: so the LXX. ἀποπομπαῖος (which does not mean 'the sent away,' the scapegoat, as most of the older interpreters took it, and as we are still rather surprised to see it rendered by Sir J. Brenton in his recent translation of the LXX., but 'the turner away,' 'the averter.' See Gesenius, *Thes.;* Kurtz, *Mos. Opfer*, p. 270). So [the Book of Enoch], probably Josephus, *Antiq.* iii. 10. 3, [Origen], and many of the Rabbins. In the strongest and most offensive sense this opinion was espoused by Spencer, Ammon, Rosenmüller, Gesenius, [von Cölln, Meier, de Wette, George Reinke], who all concur in holding that by Azazel is to be understood what was called by the Romans *averruncus*, a sort of cacodæmon inhabiting the desert, and to be propitiated

by sacrifice, so that the evils he had to inflict might be averted. The opinion was first modified by Witsius (who is also substantially followed by Meyer, Turretin, Alting, etc.) to indicate Christ's relation to the devil, to whom He was given up to be tried and vexed, but whom he overcame. And in recent times it has been still further modified by Hengstenberg, who says in his *Christology*, on Gen. iii.: 'The sending forth of the goat was only a symbolical transaction. By this act the kingdom of darkness and its prince were renounced, and the sins to which he had been tempted, and through which he had sought to make the people at large or individuals among them his own, were in a manner sent back to him; and the truth was expressed in symbol, that he to whom God grants forgiveness is freed from the power of evil.' The opinion has been still further explained and vindicated by the learned author in his *Eg. and Books of Moses*, where he supposes the action to carry a reference to the practice so prevalent in Egypt of propitiating, in times especially of famine or trouble, the evil god Typhon, who was regarded as peculiarly delighting in the desert. This reference he holds, however, not in the gross sense of the goat being a sacrifice to the evil spirit; for both goats he considers to have been the Lord's, and this latter only to have been given up by the Lord to the evil spirit, after the forgiven sins were laid upon it, as indicating that that spirit had in such a case no power to injure or destroy. Comp. Zech. iii. 1–5. Ewald, Keil, Vaihinger (in Herzog's *Encycl.*), [Wangemann, Schultz, Knobel], concur substantially in the same view."

"4. Many of the greatest scholars on the continent, Tholuck first [in this Fairbairn is in error; J. D. Michaelis stated this years before Tholuck], then Steudel, Winer, Bähr, [Paulus, Philippson, Küper], take the word as the Pealpal form of *azal* (עזל), *to remove*, with the omission of the last letter and the putting in its place of an unchangeable vowel; so that the meaning comes to be, for a complete removal or dismissal. Kurtz hesitates between this view and that of Hengstenberg, but in the result rather inclines to the latter. Certainly the contrast presented respecting the destinations of the two goats is best preserved by Hengstenberg's. But still, to bring Satan into such prominence in a religious rite—to place him in a sort of juxtaposition with Jehovah in any form—has an offensive appearance, and derives no countenance from any other parts of the Mosaic religion."

Fairbairn's own view is different from any of these. "To have," he says, "the iniquities conveyed by a symbolical action

into that desert and separate region, into a state of oblivion, was manifestly the whole intention and design of the rite. And why might not this condition of utter separateness or oblivion, to render the truth symbolized more distinct and tangible, be represented as a kind of existence, to whom God sent and consigned over the forgiven iniquities of His people? Till these iniquities were atoned for, they were in God's presence, seen and manifested before Him; but now, having been atoned, He dismisses them by a symbolical bearer to the realms of the ideal prince of separation and oblivion, that they may never more appear among the living."

III.

ON THE JEWISH INTERPRETATION OF ISAIAH LIII.

THE author has no intention of defending at length the interpretation given of the prophecy of the suffering Servant of Jehovah, but he is desirous of attracting notice to a most important element of decision which has recently been prominently brought before the religious world by the researches of a German theologian, viz. the fact that very many Jewish commentators themselves have seen in this prophecy an express announcement of the sufferings of the Messiah. These researches were published in a brief tractate of 100 pages by Dr. Wünsche, entitled "Yissurey Hammashiach *oder die Leiden des Messias in ihrer Uebereinstimmung mit der Lehre des alten Testaments und den Aussprüchen der Rabbinen in den Talmuden, Midraschim, und andern alten rabbinischen Schriften*," "The Sufferings of the Messiah in their agreement with the Teaching of the Old Testament and the Decisions of the Rabbis in the Talmud, Midrash, and other ancient Rabbinic Writings." Those who have not already perused this book will find in it not only Germanic erudition, but erudition of a rare and exegetically important nature. A brief summary of the contents and some translated extracts are appended.

Having said in his preface that modern Judaism and Christendom know little of a Messiah at all, to say nothing of a suffering Messiah: "There is no question of a suffering Messiah, say both parties; the Old Testament knows nothing of such a person, nor do the writings of the ancient synagogue: The suffering Messiah is a mere product of thought, a phantom

or a fog-spectre, which has had its origin in the morbid brain of some loose thinkers of the post-Christian age," Dr. Wünsche asserts, on the contrary, that the ancient synagogue knew a suffering Messiah, and that in the Talmud and Midrash the suffering Messiah is a prominent figure; and this assertion he undertakes to substantiate by a number of authentic extracts from the ancient rabbinic literature: "It will be our aim to show . . . that the ancient synagogue never represented the Messiah to itself otherwise than as suffering and offering Himself for the sins of His people. To this end we shall adduce a numerous selection of proof passages from the Talmud, the Midrash, and a few other ancient rabbinic writings."

Dr. Wünsche divides his investigation into two parts, the first of which deals with comments upon the Old Testament statements, and the second of which shows by extracts "that the ancient synagogue always recognised in its non-controversial writings a suffering and dying Redeemer." The first part he again divided into two sections, in one of which he treats of the biblical sacrifices as a symbolic and typical prophecy of a suffering and dying Messiah, and in the other of which he treats of the Old Testament verbal prophecies of a suffering and atoning Messiah; in both sections illustrating his point not alone by an examination of the biblical statements, but by an examination of the Jewish interpretations of those statements. Now, no more conclusive and interesting illustration of Wünsche's method can be found than his remarks upon the 53rd of Isaiah, which we translate at some length.

Having shown by extracts that the principal non-Messianic Jewish interpreters regard the Servant of Jehovah as the whole Jewish nation or individual holy men (as Rabbi Raschi, Abenezra, Kimchi, Abarbanel, Lipmann, and Rabbi Isaak), or else regard the Servant of Jehovah as a different person to the Messiah (as did Abenezra and Abarbanel, and Rabbi Saadia Gaon), Dr. Wünsche proceeds to say that "all must have often recognised that they were opposed in their interpretations to the ancient synagogue: the ancient synagogue, cleaving to the traditions of the fathers, and not yet concerned with controverting Christians, continually referred this chapter to the Messiah."

"We give," he writes, "authentic passages in which this meaning is found. In the first place, Jonathan—the Chaldee paraphrast, if allowance is made for a few distortions—has already the Messianic interpretation. His paraphrase of cap. lii. 13–15 is as follows [we omit the Hebrew, and give a retranslation of Wünsche's German translation]: 'See, my

Servant Messiah has prospered, has thriven, has increased and become very strong. As the Israelites have long expected Him, since their position dwindled among the nations, and their brilliance was no more among the sons of men; so will He scatter many nations, kings will be dumbfoundered at His presence, they will lay their hands upon their mouths when they shall see what had not been told them, and shall take to heart what they have not heard.' The sense of the paraphrase before us is this: 'Israel, hard pushed by suffering and anxieties in the exile, longs for the appearance of the Messiah, by whose aid it will vanquish its enemies, who have no suspicion of the state of the case.' The error of the translation lies in this, that what is said of the sufferings themselves is transferred by the paraphrast to the people. The following passage suffers from the same error (cap. liii. 1–3): 'Who believes our report? And the strength of the arm of the might of Jehovah, to whom is it now revealed? And the Righteous One (*i.e.* the Israelitish people) grows strong before Him (that is, the Messiah). See, like young shoots which sprout, and like a tree which sends its roots to the brooks of water, so is the holy race increased in the land which needed its own (*i.e.* the Messiah). His aspect is no common one (profane), and His terror is no common terror, but a holy glance is His glance, each one who looks upon Him regards Him full of longing. Even if despised, He makes the glory of all kingdoms to vanish, they become weak and mourn; He is as a man shaken by pains and troubles; as He removes the sight of His majesty from us, we are despised and lose respect.'" (Wünsche continues the citation to the close of the chapter, conclusively showing that the Chaldee paraphrast to some extent held to the point at issue: "In spite of many perversions," as he says, "the paraphrase of Jonathan regards the Messiah as a Redeemer and Atoner: He gives His soul to death, and through His intercession represented the people before God.")

"A very ancient witness which refers the Isaianic prophecy to the Messiah, is the Midrash *Tanchuma*, which says: 'It is the King Messiah, Who thrives, advances, and is very exalted; He thrives more than Abraham, is more exalted than Moses, and more exalted than the ministering angels.'

"Abenezra and Abarbanel further expressly ratify in their expositions the fact that the passage was applied by their ancestors to the Messiah. The former observes: 'Many apply the section to the Messiah, because our ancestors have said that on the same day on which the Temple should be destroyed the Messiah would be born, and that He would be bound in chains.'

The latter says: 'The first question is, of whom this prophecy speaks; for, behold, the wise men of the Nazarenes have applied it to that man who was hanged in Jerusalem towards the end of the second Temple, who was in their opinion the Son of the ever-adorable God, and had assumed human nature in the bosom of the Virgin, to adopt their form of expression; and *Jonathan Ben Usiel* has actually expounded the prophecy of the coming Messiah, and that is the opinion of the wise in many of their Midrash.'

"Also R. Moses Alshech (who lived in Palestine in the middle of the sixteenth century) referred (cap. lii. 13–15) to the Messiah, and to His lordship gained by suffering and woe; but chap. liii. applies, he thinks, either to Israel or to Moses. But this ambiguity in the application shows that the prophecy had aroused considerable misgivings in his mind. The Messianic meaning attached to the last three verses of chap. lii. is as follows (cap. lii. 13): 'Behold, my Servant will act wisely, etc. This prophecy is difficult to adapt, and to dovetail with the straightforward sense, so that its words may harmonize, and its thoughts correspond one with the other, and beginning and end adjust themselves in an appropriate relation. And behold, I have conceived interpretations which differ considerably from one another, which do not agree throughout in their results, and which in their details considerably deviate from the evident sense. And I, in my poverty,—what I have to say more is no effluence of wisdom. I should come very short of that if it happened that I accommodated the words to the evident sense which I must choose, and bring into harmony the parts of speech and conjunctions, and showed what was involved and what not. My opinion is this: Behold, our wise men have unanimously determined, and have received from tradition, that these words refer to King Messiah. Therefore, also, have we followed their example, that the Person of the prophecy is David the Messiah, as is recognised, and the Scriptures themselves confirm, since Ezekiel says, in the name of God: "And my Servant David shall be King over them." Therefore, also, the saying is suitable for him, "My Servant will do wisely," since what is dark is learnt from what is clear. . . . Behold, He will do wisely, *i.e.* my Servant will prosper. That is the King Messiah, since He will do wisely, as it is said, And David did wisely in all His ways. And there are four worlds which surround us,—the sublunary world, the angelic world, the stellar world, and the higher world. He will prosper in all these worlds, for He will thrive in this world, and will exalt Himself above the stellar world, as was the case with Joshua when he said, Sun, stand

still in Gibeon, and it was so. And He will exalt Himself above the world of angels, since they also go at His bidding (comp. 1 Sam. xxii. 14). He will finally be very exalted, since He will also thrive in the higher world before God, the ever-adorable, in accordance with what our Rabbis have said upon that verse (Ps. ii. 8), Ask of me, since He will be like a beloved Son who rejoices before His Lord, and His Lord says to Him, Ask of me. Behold, this is His thriving in four worlds, spoken of here and expressed by the four words—*He thrives, He exalts Himself, He is extolled*, and *very high*. All four intertwine themselves, as has been said.'

"Ver. 14. 'Truly, behold, our wise men have said that of all the sufferings which have come into the world, a third has fallen to David and the Fathers, a second third to the time of the exile, and the third third to King Messiah. We now expound according to the sense. There are punishments for sin and punishments for love which the Righteous One bears for the sins of the generations. Therefore, in truth, the man is astonished who does not know how far the gift of the recompense extends itself, and he says, Can it be the will of God, that if a man sins or his whole generation, He should be angry with a perfectly righteous man, who has never sinned, and put on him the sins of all evil-doers, so that these may rejoice, and the righteous one may suffer pain? Shall the offender be fat and strong, but he be plagued and smitten? Shall they sometimes delight themselves in his misery and ridicule his sufferings with the wine of their feasts, whilst he is still smitten on their behalf? In order now to remove misgiving at this contrast, God comes, be it accidentally or designedly, and makes known to them how far the merit of those extends who bear the sufferings of the generation and exemplify King Messiah, Who carries the sins of the children of Israel, and behold, His reward is with Him (Isa. xl. 10). The meaning is this: God, the ever-adorable, holds converse with the Israelites with whom He has already spoken until now, and said, Withdraw, withdraw, since not in haste should you go forth; and He speaks to them in great love, as one speaks with his dear son, and says: Have I not said that Jehovah would go before you, and that He who gathers you is the God of Israel: and do you not wonder that all your sin has been blotted out and abolished to the uttermost by all this goodness? Although we still deserve to wander about in pain and to be compelled to build the Temple, as was the case with the second Temple because of Cyrus! But look and see, how great is the might of Him who bears the sins for all generations! For from the greatness which I will lend to

the King Messiah, you cannot perceive how infinitely good are the sufferings of love for those who bear them!' . . . Ver. 15. As through His sufferings a fourfold honour is His, so will He sprinkle many nations through the same with honour (as is said, Isa. lxiii. 3): And their juices shall be sprinkled, *i.e.* their blood, 'since they were before Him like the breach of waters' (2 Sam. v. 20). 'Even so great shall His works be in the eyes of the nations.'

"From the 53rd chapter we extract simply the passage, ver. 1, since in it the Messianic reference of Alshech is yet more clearly set forth: 'And over whom is the arm of the Lord revealed, as it is revealed over Him? For although the arm of Jehovah rested upon Moses in the Red Sea, still it was only revealed to the Lord of the sea; but now, over whom has it been so universally revealed as over the King Messiah?'

"Finally, there yet remains one witness which refers the 53rd of Isaiah to the Messiah. It is a prayer of the synagogue which is offered every year by pious Jews at the Passover. The order of words is as follows: 'Hasten our redemption, my Beloved, before the end of the vision draws nigh; haste, since the shadows flee away. He will be prosperous and high, and very exalted, although He is now despised; He will do wisely, and punish and sprinkle many.' In this prayer there are three verses of our prophecy recognisable at a glance, viz. Isa. lii. 13, liii. 3, and liii. 13. David Levi, an English Jew, writes as a comment in his edition of the *Massora*, 'that this prayer applies to the true Messiah,' and the Amsterdam edition does the same. How is it possible that in prayer to the Almighty a passage of the Old Testament can be applied to the Messiah, and in controversy with Christians the fact be denied? There is only one escape possible: either the prophet treats in his prophecy of the Messiah, or he is speaking of another person. But in the latter case the prophecy is still unfulfilled."

IV.

ON THE SEVENTY WEEKS OF DANIEL IX.

It is doubtful whether any portion of Scripture has been the subject of a keener controversy than the seventy weeks of the prophecy of Daniel. Nor is such a controversy inexplicable, for

it becomes a stone of stumbling to all varieties of interpretations, rationalistic, naturalistic, anti-prophetical, anti-inspirational. If the exposition given in the text be conceded, there is an end to the denial of a supernatural element in Scripture, whatever be the form that denial has assumed. Not unintelligibly, therefore, a considerable literature has accumulated upon this subject; and the derided preacher who turned his hour-glass for the third time as he announced to his audience the sixty-seventh exposition of the weeks of Daniel, was considerably beneath the mark. In fact, several most erudite inquiries have been undertaken into the mere history of the question; and curious students will find much interesting matter concerning the interpretations advanced during the Patristic Age in an article by Professor Reusch of Bonn in the Tübingen *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 1868, p. 535, etc., concerning the interpretations in the Middle Ages in the well-known *Biblia Illustrata* of Abraham Calov, and concerning the interpretations of more modern times in Hävernick's *Commentar über Daniel*, or in an able article in the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* for 1863, p. 497, etc. An admirable survey will also be found in Fraidl, *Die Exegese der Siebenzig Wochen Daniels in der alten und mittleren Zeit*, 1883.

The several interpretations may be roughly placed in four classes,—first, those which find the seventieth week not in the life of Christ, but in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes; secondly, those who find the seventieth week in the years of the public ministry of Christ; thirdly, those who find it in the second advent of Christ; and, fourthly, those who combine the first and third, and see a historical reference to Antiochus and a typical reference to the second advent. The first view, advocated so long ago as the fifth century by Julius Hilarianus, has been ably expounded and defended by the leading rationalist divines of Germany, most conspicuous amongst these being Eichhorn, von Lengerke, Bertholdt, Ewald, and especially Hitzig, *Das Buch Daniel*, 1850; and Wieseler, *Die* 70 *Wochen und die* 63 *Jahrwochen des Propheten Daniel*, 1839. The investigations of the second class—the most popular and continuous of all the investigations, being advocated by a distinguished succession of great exegetes from the earliest days of the Church until now—have become familiar to English inquirers by several eminent recent works,—*e.g.* Dr. Pusey's *Daniel the Prophet;* and the translations of Auberlen's and Hengstenberg's great works: Auberlen, *The Prophecies of Daniel* (T. & T. Clark), and Hengstenberg's *Christology* (T. & T. Clark); if to these Hävernick's *Commentar über Daniel* be added, the best

that has been said from this side will be known. The opinions of the third class, which see in this prophecy an eschatological reference to the history of the kingdom of heaven from the days of Daniel to the second coming, have been clearly and fully expounded by Keil, *Biblischer Commentar, Daniel* (translated in *Foreign Theological Library*), and Kliefoth, *Commentar über Daniel.* The fourth class, which apparently partakes of the nature of a compromise between the subjective and objective schools of Biblical Theology, has been most carefully stated by Delitzsch in his article upon *Daniel* in Herzog, vol. iii., and by Hofmann in his several works.

It needs scarcely be added that the view declared for in the text, is that which has upon its side not only the great weight of authority, but also the unparalleled evidence of manifest divine adaptation; and be it noted that, concerning this view, the words of Hävernick are not extravagant when he says, speaking of the exegetical opinions of the Church until within the last hundred years: "It was generally conceded, notwithstanding all minor differences as to the details of this prophecy, that the central meaning of the seventy weeks was to be sought in *the life of Christ;* and the diversities in the interpretation of details may all be reduced to those that flow from three sources—a difference in the starting-point, a difference in the chronology of the life of Jesus, a difference in the chronological methods selected by the various commentators as a basis."

INDEX.

Small numbers in brackets preceding the numbers of pages refer to notes on those pages.

ABARBANEL, on Isa. liii., 526.
—— on origin of sacrifice, (2) 41.
Abelard, theory of atonement, 347.
Abel's sacrifice, congruity of theory of, with later practice, (1) 41.
—— divine recognition of, 35.
—— eucharistic, 37.
—— origin of, 39.
Abenezra, on *Azazel*, 522.
—— on composition of laver, (3) 67.
—— on Isa. liii., 525.
Abraham, sacrificial revelation granted to, 47.
Acacia, employment of, in Tabernacle, 65.
—— symbolism of, 121.
Alexander, Lindsay, on Calvinism, 367.
—— quoted on atonement, 350, 354.
Alford, on Blood of Covenant, (1) 280.
—— on Petrine idea of salvation, (4) 292.
—— on significance of Petrine redemption, (4) 292.
—— on various readings of eucharistic passages, (1) 280.
—— on various readings of Col. i. 14, (1) 286.
Allegorical theories of sacrifice, review of, 227.
Allegorizing of Origen, 227.
Alshech, on Isa. liii., 527.
Altar, generally, 45, 122.
Altar of burnt-offering, injunctions concerning, 67.
—— essential significance of, 95.
—— symbolism of, 122.
Altar of incense, essential significance of, 95.
—— injunctions concerning, 67.
Alting, on *Azazel*, 523.
Ambrose, and doctrine of atonement, 338.
Ammon, on *Azazel*, 522.
Andrews, on paschal nature of eucharist, (2) 465.
Anointing oil of priesthood, (1) 72.
Anselm, quoted on exceptional nature of Christ's death, 311.
—— on theory of atonement, 340.
Ante-Nicene Fathers, theory of atonement, 331.
Apollonius Rhodius, on ἱλαστήριον, (1) 284.
Apostolic Fathers, theory of atonement, 331.
Aquila, on *Azazel*, 521.
Aquinas, and doctrine of atonement, and (2) 345, 374.
—— quoted on method, 17.
Archer Butler, quoted on typical significance of Mosaism, 171.
Ark of covenant, essential significance of, 94.
—— injunctions concerning, 68.
—— symbolism of, 122.
Arminian theories of atonement, 360.
Armour, theory of atonement, 374.
Arnold, Matthew, quoted on a time to speak, 371.
Articles of Smalkald, on eucharist, 483.
Asham, Hellenistic equivalents of, 520.
—— significance of, 508.
—— See *Trespass Offerings*.
Aspersion of blood, antitype of, 437.
—— general injunctions concerning, 129.
—— symbolism of, 129.
Assimilation of Mosaic doctrine effected by—divided monarchy in Israel, 189; divided monarchy in Judah, 190; Hagiographa and their authors, 193; historical books of Hagiographa, 195; Joshua, 186; Judges, 186; Moses, 185; poetical books of

Hagiographa, 197; prophetical books, 208.
Athanasius, and doctrine of atonement, 338.
Atonement, apprehension of, aided by doctrine of sacrifice, 24.
—— day of, essential significance of, 117.
—— injunctions concerning, 87.
—— symbolism of, 140.
—— Mosaic, efficacy of, 151.
—— essential significance of, 101, 423.
—— extent of, 319.
—— New Testament doctrine of, 290.
—— review of theories of. See *Review of.*
Atonement of New Testament antitypical of that of Old, 427.
Atonement of Old and New Testaments compared, 418.
Auberlen, on seventy weeks, (3) 218, 530.
Augsburg Confession, definition of sacrament, 153, 460.
—— quoted on eucharist, 483.
Augustine, quoted on Old Testament, 29.
—— quoted on paradisaic sacrifice, 32.
—— quoted on relation of Old Testament to New, 269, 418.
Azazel, 87, 142, 521.

Baehr, canon for the discovery of the symbolic, 118.
—— contributions to the literature of Mosaism, (1) 59; reviewed, 248.
—— of priesthood, (1) 69.
—— of purifications, (3) 72.
—— of sacrifices, (3) 76.
—— of tabernacle, (1) 64.
—— of temple, (9) 188.
—— of times and seasons, (7) 85.
—— on essential significance of purification, (1) 100.
—— on essential significance of tabernacle, (5) 65.
—— on form of cherubim, (1) 68.
—— on inner covering of tabernacle, (5) 65.
—— on interpretation of *Azazel*, 523.
—— on interpretation of Lev. xvii. 11, (2) 103.
—— on nature of *shesh*, (4) 66.
—— on nature of patriarchal sacrifice, (1) 48.
—— on significance of waving, 136.
—— quoted on study of Mosaic cultus, 91.
—— synonym of *shelamim*, 506.
Barnabas, Epistle of, on theory of atonement, 332.
Basil the Great, doctrine of atonement, 338.
Bauer, on *Azazel*, 522.
Baumgarten, synonym of *shelamim*, 507.
Baur, quoted on Origen's theory of atonement, 337.
Ben Gerson, on origin of sacrifice, (2) 41.
Berliner's *Raschi*, (5) 76.
Bernard, doctrine of atonement, 338.
Bertholdt, on seventy weeks, 530.
Bible, apprehension of, aided by doctrine of sacrifice, 21.
Biblical theology, nature and method of, 18.
Biblico-theological theories of atonement, 291.
—— of Old Testament sacrifices, 248.
Bishgagah, interpretation of, 106.
Bleek, quoted on *nabhi*, 205.
Blemishes of sacrifices, (1) 77.
Blood, antitype of, 434.
—— essential significance of, 103.
—— injunctions concerning, 73, 77.
—— sacramental significance of, 151.
—— symbolic significance of, 129, 141.
Bloodless sacrifices, essential significance of, 109.
—— injunctions concerning, 81.
—— symbolism of, 137.
Bochart, on *Azazel*, 522.
Boldich, contribution to literature of priesthood, (1) 69.
Bossuet, quoted on significance of *Jesus*, 290.
Brass, employed in Tabernacle, 66.
—— symbolism of, 121, 123.
Braun, contribution to literature of priesthood, (1) 69, (7) 71.
Bunsen, on interpretation of Lev. xvii. 11, (2) 103.
—— on synonym of *shelamim*, 507.
Burge, theory of atonement, (1) 368.
Burney, theory of atonement, (1) 372.
Burnt-offering, antitype of, 457.
—— essential significance of, 104.
—— injunctions concerning, 76.
—— symbolism of, 135.
—— synonym of *olah*, 506.
Bushnell, origin of sacrifice, (1) 42.
—— quoted on connection between Mosaism and Christianity, 419.
—— quoted on nature of type, 165.
—— quoted on pre-Christian atonement, 143.
—— theory of atonement, 388.
Butler, Archer, quoted on types, 171.

Butler, Bishop, quoted on biblical study, 22, 35.
Buttmann, on *ἱλαστήριον*, (1) 280.
Buxtorf, contribution to literature of Mosaism, (1) 59.
Byssus, what, (3) 66.

Cain's sacrifice, 35, 41.
Calov, contribution to literature of seventy weeks, 530.
—— on *Azazel*, 522.
Calvin, and theory of atonement, 349.
—— quoted on eucharist, 487.
—— quoted on synonym of *shelamim*, 506.
Calvinistic theory of eucharist, 487.
Campbell, M'Leod, theory of atonement, 376.
Canon for study of symbolism, 116.
Carey, on Calvinism, 367.
Carlyle, quoted on symbolism, 115.
Carpzov, contribution to literature of priesthood, (1) 69.
—— on *Azazel*, 522.
Catechismus Major, quoted on eucharist, 483.
Cave, essay on Leviticus, 113.
—— congregational lecture on inspiration of Old Testament, 260.
Celsus, quoted on experience as a source of knowledge, 183.
Chagigah, 465.
Chattath, Hellenistic equivalents of, 520.
—— significance of, 508.
—— See *Sin-Offering*.
Cherubim, form of, (1) 68.
—— symbolism of, 121.
Cheyne, on *yazzeh*, (2) 217.
Chrysostom, interpretation of *eucharistia*, (4) 463.
—— on origin of sacrifice, (2) 41.
—— quoted on divine plan in Law, 57.
Clarke, Freeman, theory of atonement, 372.
Classical sacrificial terms not identical with Hellenistic, 275.
Classification of theories of atonement, 372.
—— of eucharist, 472.
—— of Old Testament sacrifice, 225.
—— of sacrificial injunctions, 83.
Cleansing. See *Purification*.
Clement of Rome, on atonement, 332.
Clericus, on *Azazel*, 522.
—— on *yazzeh*, (2) 217.
Clothing. See *Vestments*.
—— of Levites, (2) 70.
Cochrane, theory of atonement, 375.
Colours of Tabernacle, injunctions concerning, 65.
—— symbolism of, 121.
Combustion, antitype of, 424.
—— symbolism of, 131.
Concluding meal, symbolism of, 132.
Confessio Augustana, quoted on nature of eucharist, 460.
—— quoted on nature of sacrament, 153.
Confessio Orthodoxa, quoted on nature of sacrament, 459.
Confession, Westminster, quoted on nature of eucharist, 488.
—— quoted on nature of sacrament, 460.
Connection between Old and New Testament sacrifices, 418, 449.
Consecration of priesthood, injunctions concerning, 70.
—— symbolism of, 124.
Contrast between prophets and apostles, 449.
Corrective revelation granted to Abraham, 47.
Court of Tabernacle, essential significance of, 95.
—— injunctions concerning, 66.
—— symbolism of, 123.
Coverings of Tabernacle, 65.
Crawford, quoted on revealed character of atonement, 326.
—— quoted on sacrificial terminology borrowed from heathenism, 275.
Crell, contribution to literature of atonement, (1) 358.
Cremation. See *Combustion*.
Cremer, on *ἱλαστήριον* (1) 284.
—— on scriptural conception of death, (4) 315.
Creuzer, quoted on symbol, 117.
Crisp, theory of atonement, 354.
"Criticism," referred to, 18, (1) 59, 259.
Curcellæus, theory of atonement, 360.
Cyril, on *Azazel*, 522.
—— on origin of sacrifice, (2) 41.

Dale, on nature of patriarchal sacrifice, (1) 48.
—— quoted on absence of subjective side in Mosaism, 146.
—— quoted on Mosaic ransoms, 279.
—— quoted on linguistic use of Old Testament, 291.
—— theory of atonement, 403.

Davison, on incomprehensible nature of type, 165.
—— on origin of sacrifice, (2) 41.
—— on reserve of Law, (2) 92.
—— on silence of Mosaism as to its own symbolism, 117.
—— quoted on moral and predictive in prophecy, (1) 208.
—— quoted on prophecy, 92.
Day of atonement, essential significance of, 112.
—— injunctions concerning, 87.
—— symbolism of, 140.
Death, scriptural conception of, 312.
Definition of sacrifice, 26.
Delitzsch, labours in Old Testament exegesis referred to, (6) 199.
—— on imposition of hand, (1) 129.
—— on interpretation of Lev. xvii. 11, (2) 103.
—— on nature of patriarchal sacrifice, (1) 49.
—— on recognition of Abel's sacrifice, (3) 35.
—— on seventy weeks, 531.
—— on significance of trespass-offering, (1) 109.
—— on *yazzeh*, (2) 217.
—— quoted on interpretation of types in Christ, 165.
—— revising Oehler, (7) 85.
De Maistre, on combustion, (1) 132.
—— quoted on sacrificial victims, 265.
Deutsch, quoted on effect of Exile, 191.
Development of Mosaic doctrine by prophetical books, 208.
—— of patriarchal sacrifice, 44.
De Wette, contribution to literature of atonement, (1) 103.
—— on *Azazel*, 522.
—— synonym of *shelamim*, 506.
Dewey, Orville, theory of atonement, 373.
Deyling, on *Azazel*, 522.
Diestel, on biblical method, (1) 19.
—— on *yazzeh*, (2) 217.
Difference between sin and trespass offerings, (3) 80.
Difficulty in study of Mosaic sacrifice, 63.
—— pre-Mosaic sacrifice, 31.
Diognetus, Epistle of, on atonement, 333.
Dion Chrysostom, on ἱλαστήριον, (1) 284.
Divided monarchy, assimilation during, 189.
Divine recognition of Abel's sacrifice, 35.
Division of Hagiographa, 194.
—— of Mosaic injunctions, 63.
—— of prophecy, 208.
—— of subject, 27.
—— of theories of atonement, 372.
—— of theories of eucharist, 472.
—— of theories of sacrifice, 225.
Dorner, contribution to doctrine of person of Christ, (1) 309.
—— quoted on value of biblical theology, 18.
—— theory of atonement, 375.
Drechsler, on division of Isaiah, (4) 213.
Drink-offering, essential significance of, 109.
—— injunctions concerning, 82.
—— synonym of *nesek*, 510.
Duns Scotus, theory of atonement, 345.
Duties of priesthood in Mosaic times, injunctions concerning, 70.
—— symbolism of, 124.
Duties of priesthood, symbolism of, in post-Mosaic times, (3) 70.
Dwight, on Calvinism, 367.

Ebrard, contribution to literature of Mosaic sacrifice, (3) 76.
—— on imposition of hand, (1) 129.
—— on interpretation of Lev. xvii. 11, (2) 103.
—— place in study of Mosaism, 256.
—— synonym of *shelamim*, 507.
Ecce Homo, quoted on significance of Lamb of God, 271.
Edwardean theory of atonement, 368, 375.
Edwards, Jonathan, on Calvinism, 367.
Edwards, Lewis, theory of atonement, 374.
Effects of work of Christ, 317.
Efficacy of Mosaic atonement, 149.
—— New Testament atonement a proof it is antitypical, 427.
Eichhorn, on seventy weeks, 530.
—— on *yazzeh*, (2) 217.
Emerson, quoted on great men, 193.
Emmons, on Calvinism, 367.
—— theory of atonement, (1) 358.
Ephod of priests and laity, (3) 72.
Epiphanius, quoted on sacrificial names of Christ, 274.
Essays and Reviews, quoted on Jewish nation, 24.
—— quoted on *seculum rationalisticum*, 237.

Essential significance of atonement, 101.
—— bloodless offerings, 109.
—— burnt-offering, 104.
—— day of atonement, 112.
—— feast of Tabernacles, 113.
—— jubilee year, 110.
—— Mosaic injunctions generally, 91.
—— new moons, 110.
—— Passover, 111.
—— peace-offering, 105.
—— Pentecost, 111.
—— presentation, 101.
—— priesthood, 96.
—— purification, 98.
—— sabbaths, 110.
—— Tabernacle, 93.
—— times and seasons, 109.
—— trespass-offering, 109.
Eucharist, instituted at Passover, (2) 465.
—— in what sense sacrificial, 463.
—— not an antitype of all sacrifices, 481.
—— not a *sacrificium propitiatorium*, 480.
—— review of theories of, 472.
Eusebius of Cæsarea, on origin of sacrifice, (2) 41.
Ewald, contribution to literature of Mosaism, (1) 59.
—— of priesthood, (1) 69.
—— of purifications, (4) 72.
—— of sacrifices, (5) 76.
—— of Tabernacle, (1) 64.
—— of times and seasons, (7) 85.
—— labours in Old Testament exegesis referred to, (6) 199.
—— on *Azazel*, 523.
—— on etymology of *olah*, 474.
—— on imposition of hand, (1) 129.
—— on "the priest," (1) 72.
—— on sacrifice of rest, 83.
—— on seventy weeks, 530.
—— on significance of *nabhi*, (1) 205.
—— on synonym of *shelamim*, 506.
—— place in study of Mosaism, 256.
—— quoted on effect of Exile, 192.
Exclusive atonement of Old and New Testaments an argument for antitypical character of latter, 430.
Expiatory nature of patriarchal sacrifice, (1) 48.
Explanation of Old Testament an argument for antitypical nature of New, 431.
Extent of Mosaic atonement, 148.
—— of New Testament atonement a proof it is antitypical, 435.

Faber, on origin of sacrifice, (2) 42.
—— on prophetic element in Mosaic sacrifices, (1) 166.
—— quoted on Mosaic symbolism, 116.
Fairbairn, canon for discovery of symbolic, 119.
—— contributions to literature of Mosaism, (1) 59.
—— priesthood, (1) 69.
—— purifications, (4) 72.
—— sacrifices, (5) 76.
—— Tabernacle, (1) 64.
—— times and seasons, (7) 85.
—— on *Azazel*, 521.
—— on expiatory nature of patriarchal sacrifice, (1) 49.
—— on imposition of hand, (1) 129.
—— on inner covering of Tabernacle, (5) 65.
—— on interpretation of Lev. xvii. 11, (2) 103.
—— on origin of Abel's sacrifice, (1) 39.
—— on recognition of Abel's sacrifice, (3) 35.
—— on signification of purification, (1) 100.
—— on signification of trespass-offering, (2) 109.
—— quoted on *asham*, 81.
—— quoted on nature of prophecy, 206.
—— quoted on scriptural significance of type, 161.
—— quoted on source of confusion between sin and trespass offerings, 477.
Farrar, on non-paschal nature of eucharist, (2) 465.
Feast of Weeks, essential significance of, 111.
—— Tabernacles, essential significance of, 113.
Feasts. See *Times and Seasons*.
Ferrier, theory of atonement, (4) 375.
Festal-offering synonym of *tsevach*, 479.
Figurative use of sacrifices to describe work of Christ, 424.
—— work of man, 450.
Fire-offering synonym of *ishsheh*, 513.
First-fruits, essential significance of, 109.
—— feast of, essential significance of, 111.
—— injunctions concerning, 82.
Flatt, theory of atonement, 375.
Folly of iniquitous observance of Mosaic sacrifice exposed, in poetical books of Hagiographa, 198.
—— in prophetical books, 209.
Forgiveness of sins, and Mosaic atonement, 150.
—— and patriarchal atonement, 48.

Formula Concordiæ, quoted on eucharist, 483.
Foster, translation of Grotius, (2) 360.
Fraidl, on seventy weeks, 531.
Friederich, contribution to literature of Tabernacle, (1) 64.
—— on inner covering of Tabernacle, (5) 65.
—— on significance of Tabernacle, (1) 95.
Frommann, contribution to literature of Johannine doctrine, (1) 291.
Fuel as a sacrifice, (9) 82.
Fulfilment of prophecy, an argument for antitypical nature of New Testament atonement, 429.
Fuller, Andrew, on Calvinism, 367.
Furniture of Tabernacle, essential significance of, 94.
—— injunctions concerning, 67.
—— symbolism of, 122.

Gaal, Hellenistic equivalent of, 521.
—— significance of, 518.
General ritual of sacrifice, 128.
George, on *Azazel*, 522.
Gesenius, on *Azazel*, 522.
—— on Exodus xxvi. 36, (1) 66.
—— on *ishsheh*, 513.
—— on Isa. xxviii. 18, 484.
—— on synonym of *shelamim*, 506.
—— on *yazzeh*, (2) 217.
Gess, theory of atonement, 375.
Gilbert, on Calvinism, 367.
Ginsburg, on paschal celebration, (1) 467.
Gnostic theory of atonement, 336.
Gnosticism, general view of, 334.
Godward theories of atonement, 374.
Godwyn, contribution to literature of Mosaism, (1) 59.
—— on *Azazel*, 524.
—— quoted on study of Mosaism, 25.
Gold employed in Tabernacle, 65.
—— symbolism of, 121.
Governmental theory of atonement, 375.
Gramberg, on significance of purification, (1) 100.
Greek Church on sacraments, 458.
Gregory the Great and the atonement, 338.
Gregory Nazianzen and the atonement, 339.
Griffin, theory of atonement, 368.
Grotius, on fat of firstlings, (2) 34.
—— theory of atonement, 360.
Ground-plan of Tabernacle, injunctions concerning, 66.
—— symbolism of, 120.

Habits of priesthood, injunctions concerning, 71.
—— symbolism of, 125.
Hagiographa, division of, 194.
—— what, 193.
Hagiographic conception of Mosaic sacrifice, 193.
Hall, Robert, on Calvinism, 367.
Hamilton, quotation from Lessing, 376.
Hasæus, contribution to literature on *shittim*, (4) 65.
Hävernick, contribution to literature of seventy weeks, 530.
—— on imposition of hand, (1) 129.
—— place in study of Mosaism, 256.
—— quoted on seventy weeks, 530.
Hebrews, testimony of Epistle to, to sacrificial nature of work of Christ, 287.
Hegel, quoted on symbolism, 44.
Heine, on *Azazel*, 522.
Hellenistic sacrificial terms not to be confounded with classical, 275.
Hendewerck, on *yazzeh*, (2) 217.
Hengstenberg, canon for discovery of symbolic, 119.
—— contributions to literature of Mosaism, 255.
—— of sacrifice, (3) 76.
—— of tabernacle, (1) 64.
—— labours in Old Testament exegesis referred to, (6) 199.
—— on *Azazel*, 522.
—— on expiatory nature of patriarchal sacrifices, 48.
—— on imposition of hand, (1) 129.
—— on interpretation of Lev. xvii. 11, (2) 103.
—— on Messianic conception of patriarchs, (7) 52.
—— on seventy weeks, 530.
—— on significance of Tabernacle, (1) 95.
—— on significance of trespass-offering, (2) 109.
—— quoted on heaving and waving, 136.
—— quoted on relation between sacrifice and prayer, (1) 51.
—— quoted on seventy weeks, 221.
—— quoted on subjective accompaniment of Mosaic sacrifices, 148.
—— synonym of *shelamim*, 506.
Hess, on sanitary purpose of Mosaism, (3) 174.
Hesychius, on *ἱλαστήριον*, (1) 284.
High priest, essential significance of, 96.
—— injunctions concerning, 71.
—— symbolism of, 125.

High priest, when appellation first used, (1) 72.
Hildebert of Tours, coiner of *transubstantiation*, (1) 470.
Hill, Principal, on Calvinism, 367.
Hitzig, labours in Old Testament exegesis referred to, (6) 199.
—— on seventy weeks, 530.
—— on *yazzeh*, (2) 217.
Hoffman, contribution to literature of Mosaic sacrifices, (1) 59.
Hofmann, contribution to literature of Mosaic sacrifices, (1) 59, (5) 76.
—— on *Azazel*, 522.
—— on imposition of hand, (1) 129.
—— on interpretation of Lev. xvii. 11, (2) 103.
—— on recognition of Abel's sacrifice, (3) 35.
—— on seventy weeks, 531.
—— on significance of Petrine redemption, (1) 282.
—— on significance of tabernacle, (1) 95.
—— on synonym of *shelamim*, 506.
Holocaust. See *Burnt-Offering*.
Holy of Holies, essential significance of, 95.
—— injunctions concerning, 66.
—— symbolism of, 122.
Holy place, essential significance of, 95.
—— injunctions concerning, 66.
—— symbolism of, 122.
Hopkins, on Calvinism, 367.
Horns of altar, symbolism of, 122.
Hugo St. Victor, theory of atonement, 338.
Hupfeld, contribution to literature of times and seasons, (7) 85.
Huther, on significance of Petrine redemption, (1) 282.
Hyper-Calvinist theory of atonement, 350, 375.

Ignatius, theory of atonement, 332.
Ignorantly, *through ignorance*, interpretation of, 107.
Ἱλασμός, signification of, (1) 287.
Ἱλαστήριον, signification of, (1) 284.
Importance of inquiry for apprehension of Bible, 21.
—— of Judaism, 23.
—— of atonement, 24.
—— of sacerdotalism, 25.
Imposition of hand, antitype of, 455.
—— etymological significance of, (3) 77.
—— symbolism of, 128.
—— various interpretations of, (1) 129.
Incense, essential significance of, 109.
—— injunctions concerning, 82.
Individual offerings under law, 84.
Iniquitous observance, consequences of, exposed, by Hagiographa, 198.
—— by prophets, 209.
Injunctions, Mosaic, concerning bloodless sacrifices, 81.
—— burnt-offerings, 76.
—— incense, 82.
—— Levites, 69.
—— peace-offering, 79.
—— priests, 70.
—— purifications, 72.
—— shew-bread, 82.
—— sin-offering, 79.
—— Tabernacle, 64.
—— times and seasons, 85.
—— trespass-offering, 80.
—— division of, 63.
Irenæus, on origin of sacrifice, (2) 41.
—— quoted on diabolic reference of atonement, (1) 337.
—— quoted on sacrificial nature of eucharist, 458.
Irving, Edward, theory of atonement, 374.
Isaiah, unity of, assumed, (3) 213.
Isaianic office in doctrine of sacrifice, 213.
Ishsheh, Hellenistic equivalents of, 520.
—— signification of, 513.

Jacob, Rabbi, on paradisaic sacrifice, 33.
Jahn, on *Azazel*, 522.
James, doctrine of, on Christian sacrifice, 439.
—— testimony to sacrificial nature of work of Christ, 280.
Jarchi, on *Azazel*, 522.
Jay, on Calvinism, 367.
Jesus, testimony to sacrificial nature of His work, 278.
Jewish interpretation of Isa. liii., 524.
John, on the work of Christ, 299.
—— doctrine of, on Christian sacrifice, 442.
—— literature of doctrinal system of, (1) 291.
—— testimony to sacrificial nature of work of Christ, 286.
John the Baptist, testimony to sacrificial nature of work of Christ, 277.
Josephus, comparatively useless for study of Mosaic sacrifices, 63.
—— on *Azazel*, 522.
—— significance of Tabernacle, (1) 95.
—— synonym of *shelamim*, 506.
Joshua, assimilation of doctrine of sacrifice effected in time of, 186.

Jowett, quoted on desirability of a chronology of prophets, 204.
—— on vagueness of word *sacrifice*, 25.
Jubilee year, essential significance of, 110.
Judaism, apprehension of, aided by doctrine of sacrifice, 23.
Jude, doctrine of, on Christian sacrifice, 439.
—— testimony to sacrificial nature of work of Christ, 281.
Judges, assimilation of doctrine of sacrifice effected in times of, 186.
Julius Hilarianus, on seventy weeks, 530.
Justin Martyr, on origin of sacrifice, (2) 41.
—— quoted on sacrificial nature of prayers and thanksgiving, 449.
—— quoted on atonement, 333.

Kahnis, quoted on sacrificial blood, 130.
—— significance of *atone*, 144.
—— synonym of *shelamim*, 506.
Kalil, 474.
Kalisch, canon for discovery of symbolic, 119.
—— contribution to literature, of Mosaism, (1) 59; of naturalistic theory of Old Testament, 259.
—— of priesthood, (1) 69.
—— of sacrifices, (5) 76.
—— on expiatory nature of patriarchal sacrifices, (1) 48.
—— on human sacrificing, (5) 47.
—— on imposition of hand, (1) 129.
—— on origin of sacrifice, 32.
—— on *shechar*, 82.
—— on meanings of *kohen*, (2) 96.
—— on verbal utterances accompanying imposition of hand, (7) 148.
—— place in study of Mosaism, 256.
—— quoted on futility of typical exposition, 161, (5) 165.
—— on north side, (2) 78.
—— on sacrificial blood, 130.
—— on significance of Mosaism, 178.
Keil, contribution to literature, of Mosaism, (1) 59.
—— of priesthood, (1) 69.
—— of purification, (4) 72.
—— of sacrifices, (5) 76.
—— of Tabernacle, (1) 64.
—— of Temple, (9) 188.
—— of times and seasons, (7) 85.
—— on *Azazel*, 523.
—— on expiatory nature of patriarchal sacrifice, 1 (49).
Keil, on fat of firstlings, (4) 34.
—— on form of cherubim, (1) 68.
—— on imposition of hand, (1) 129.
—— on inner covering of Tabernacle, (5) 65.
—— on interpretation of Lev. v. 1, (1) 277.
—— on interpretation of Lev. xvii. 11, (2) 103.
—— on nature of *shesh*, (3) 66.
—— on origin of sacrifice, (1) 42.
—— on seventy weeks, 531.
—— on significance of purification, (1) 100.
—— on significance of Tabernacle, (1) 95.
—— on significance of trespass-offering, (1) 109.
—— place in study of Mosaism, 256.
—— quoted on religious value of Chronicles, (1) 195.
—— on synonym of *shelamim*, 474.
Kennicott, reading of Lev. iv. 29, (4) 77.
Kipper, Hellenistic equivalents of, 521.
—— significance of, 514.
Klaiber, contribution to literature of Mosaic sacrifices, (5) 76.
—— quoted on scriptural conception of death, 315.
Kliefoth, contribution to literature of Mosaism, (1) 59.
—— on imposition of hand, (1) 129.
—— on interpretation of Lev. xvii. 11, (2) 103.
—— on paradisaic sacrifice, (2) 33.
—— on seventy weeks, 531.
—— place in study of Mosaism, 256.
Knobel, contribution to literature, of Mosaism, (1) 59.
—— of sacrifices, (5) 76.
—— of Tabernacle, 1 (64).
—— labours in old Testament exegesis referred to, (6) 199.
—— on *Azazel*, 523.
—— on imposition of hand, (1) 129.
—— on inner covering of Tabernacle, (5) 65.
—— on interpretation of Lev. xvii. 11, (2) 103.
—— on interpretation of *nasa avono*, (1) 277.
—— on significance of Tabernacle, (1) 96.
—— on sins of ignorance, 106.
—— on various views upon *asham*, (1) 509.
—— on *yazzeh*, (2) 217.
—— place in study of Mosaism, 256.
—— quoted on sins of ignorance, 106.

Knobel, quoted on skin of sea-cow as a covering for Tabernacle, (3) 66.
—— synonym of *shelamim*, 506.
König, contribution to literature of purifications, (4) 72.
—— views on purifications, (1) 100.
Kuenen, quoted on naturalistic theory of Old Testament, 259.
Küper, contribution to literature, of priesthood, (1) 69.
—— of sacrifices, (5) 76.
—— on *Azazel*, 523.
—— on ephod of priests and laity, (3) 72.
—— on imposition of hand, (1) 129.
—— on significance of trespass-offering, (1) 109.
—— place in study of Mosaism, 256.
—— quoted on nature of prophecy, 206.
—— quoted on significance of atonement, 102.
Kurtz, contribution to literature, of Mosaism, (1) 59.
—— of priesthood, (1) 69.
—— of purifications, (3) 72.
—— of sacrifices, (5) 76.
—— of Tabernacle, (1) 64.
—— of times and seasons, (7) 85.
—— on *Azazel*, 522.
—— on expiatory nature of patriarchal sacrifice, (1) 48.
—— on imposition of hand, (1) 129.
—— on inner covering of Tabernacle, (5) 65.
—— on interpretation of Lev. xvii. 11, (2) 103.
—— on interpretation of Isa. xxviii. 18, 484.
—— on significance of purification, (1) 100.
—— on Tabernacle, (1) 95.
—— on trespass-offering, (1) 109.
—— place in study of Mosaism, 256.
—— quoted on relative significance of animals and plants as materials for sacrifice, 138.
—— quoted on sacrificial meal, 132.
—— quoted on significance of trespass-offering, 476.
—— synonym of *shelamim*, 506.

Landerer, on biblical method, (1) 19.
Leper, purification of, injunctions concerning, 75.
—— symbolism of, 126.
Lessing, quotation on education of human race, 262.
Levites, clothing of, (2) 70.
—— injunctions concerning, 70.
Leyrer, contribution to literature, of purification, (4) 72.
—— of Tabernacle, (1) 64.
—— of times and seasons, (7) 85.
—— on inner covering of Tabernacle, (5) 65.
—— on significance of purification, (1) 100.
Lias, theory of atonement, (1) 372.
Lightfoot, contribution to literature of Mosaism, (1) 59.
—— on expiatory nature of patriarchal sacrifice, (1) 49.
—— on girdle of priest, (11) 71.
—— on paschal celebration, (1) 467.
Limborch, theory of atonement, 364.
Literature of Mosaism, (1) 59.
Litton, contribution to literature, of Mosaism, (1) 59.
—— on origin of sacrifice, (2) 42.
—— on symbolism as inferentially known, 117.
—— quoted on absence of prophecy in types, 166.
—— quoted on symbolical nature of ancient religions, 159.
—— quoted on symbolism of Mosaic sacrifices, 137.
—— quoted on typical theories, 92.
Living water, (4) 74.
Lord's Supper. See *Eucharist*.
Lowman, contribution to literature, of Mosaism, (1) 59.
—— of priesthood, (1) 69.
—— of Tabernacle, (1) 64.
—— sacrifices, (5) 76.
—— on indirect purpose of Mosaism, 174.
—— place in study of Mosaism, 246.
—— quoted in approval of Mosaism, 178.
Lowth, quoted on figurative use of Mosaic cultus, 419.
—— quoted on Messianic psalms, 202.
—— quoted on religious aim of Mosaism, (1) 175.
Lubbock, quoted on evolutional nature of sacrifice, 32.
Lund, on *Azazel*, 522.
Luther, and theory of atonement, 369.
—— *Catechismus Major*, on eucharist, 483.
—— on *Azazel*, 522.
—— on interpretation of Lev. xvii. 11, (2) 103.
—— on significance of Tabernacle, (1) 95.
—— quoted on folly of typical interpretations, 161.
—— synonym of *shelamim*, 506.

Lutheran Church, on nature of sacrament, 460.
Lutheran theory of eucharist, 482.
Λύτρον. See *Ransom.*

M'Cosh, quoted on theological abuse of word *type*, 160.
Magee, on imposition of hand, (1) 129.
—— on origin of sacrifice, (2) 42.
—— on patriarchal sacrifice, (1) 49.
—— on "process of time," (3) 34.
—— quoted on sacrificial nature of work of Christ, 289.
—— quoted on sins of ignorance, 107.
—— quoted on Spencer's influence, 243.
Maimonides, on origin of sacrifice, (2) 41.
—— on significance of purification, (1) 100.
—— on Tabernacle, (1) 95.
—— quoted on living water, (1) 74.
—— quoted on sinning with a high hand, (6) 147.
Manipulation of blood. See *Aspersion.*
Manward theories of atonement, 372.
Marbach, contribution to literature of Mosaic sacrifices, (5) 76.
Marsh, quoted on nature of type, 163.
Martensen, quoted on nature of eucharist, 484.
—— quoted on nature of type, 162.
Martineau, theory of atonement, 372.
Materials of Tabernacle, injunctions concerning, 65.
—— symbolism of, 121.
Maur, synonym of *shelamim*, 506.
Maurer, on *yazzeh*, (2) 217.
Maurice, theory of atonement, 375.
Maxey, theory of atonement, (1) 368.
Maybaum, contribution to literature of Mosaic priesthood, (1) 69.
Meal-offering, } essential significance
Meat-offering, } of, 109.
—— injunctions concerning, 81.
—— symbolism of, 137.
—— synonyms of *minchah*, 510, 511.
Melanchthon, and theory of atonement, 349.
Mercy-seat. See *Ark of Covenant.*
Messianic and sacrificial teaching of Old Testament united by prophecy, 213.
Messianic conceptions, of patriarchal age, 52.
—— of Hagiographa, 200.
—— of prophets, 211.
Method of investigation generally stated, 18.
Method, in description of atoning work of Christ, 274, 291.
—— of Mosaic atonement, 146.
—— of New Testament atonement, a proof it is antitypical, 434.
Methodist theory of atonement, 370.
Michaelis, on *Azazel*, 523.
—— on sanitary purpose of Mosaism, (3) 174.
—— on significance of combustion, (1) 132.
—— on purification, (1) 100.
—— on symbolism of calves at Dan and Bethel, (5) 189.
Midrash on Isa. liii., 526.
Miley, theory of atonement, 370.
Milman, quoted in approval of Mosaism, 177.
—— on time of Judges, 186.
Minchah, Hellenistic equivalents of, 488.
—— meaning of, (1) 34, 510, 511.
Minor purposes of Mosaism, 174.
Mishna Middoth, quoted on garments of priesthood, (8) 70.
Moderate Calvinist theory of atonement, 366.
Mosaic sacrifice an advance upon patriarchal, 59.
Moses, assimilation of doctrine effected in lifetime of, 184.
Murphy's Carey Lecture, 513.

Nabhi, interpretation of, 205.
Nasa, interpretation of, (1) 218.
National conception of Mosaic sacrifice, 183.
National offerings under law, 83.
Naturalistic theory of Old Testament, 259.
Nature, of Mosaic atonement, 144.
—— of New Testament atonement, a proof it is antitypical, 434.
—— of type, 159, 426.
—— of atoning work of Christ, 307.
Necessity of work of Christ, 303.
Nesek, Hellenistic equivalent of, 526.
—— significance of, 510.
Nethinim, who, (2) 69.
Neumann, contribution to literature, of Tabernacle, (1) 64.
—— of sacrifice, (5) 76.
—— on imposition of hand, (1) 129.
—— on inner covering of Tabernacle, (5) 65.
—— on origin of sacrifice, (1) 42.
—— place in study of Mosaism, 256.
—— quoted on origin of sacrifice, 31.
—— synonym of *shelamim*, 507.
New England theology, 366.

New moon, essential significance of, 110.
Newman, quoted on eternal priesthood of Christ, 495.
New Testament, description of work of Christ as sacrificial, 274.
—— doctrine of atonement, 290.
—— of Christian sacrifice, 438.
—— of Christian sacrifice generally considered, 272.
—— postulate of Old Testament, 460, 492.
—— projected into eternity, 494.
—— views of Judaism, an argument for antitypical nature of New Testament atonement, 435.
Nitzsch, quoted on nature of type, 163.
Nonnus, on ἱλαστήριον, (1) 284.
Norris, theory of atonement, (4) 374.
Notes on—
Absence of thoroughgoing theory of atonement before Anselm, (1) 338.
Alford's view of Petrine *salvation*, (4) 292.
Apparatus for sacrifice in Herodian Temple, (5) 77.
Assumed unity of Isaiah, (3) 213.
Biblical method, 19.
Blemishes of ineligible victims, (2) 77.
Classification of theories of atonement, (1) 372.
Clothing of Levites, (2) 70.
Congruity of theory of Abel's sacrifice with later practice, (1) 41.
Definition of substitution, (1) 371.
Difference between sin and trespass offering, (3) 80.
Duties of priesthood in later times, (3) 70.
Editions of Spencer, (2) 237.
Expiatory sacrifice in pre-Mosaic times, 48.
"Fat of firstlings," (1) 34.
Form of cherubim, 68.
Governmental theories of atonement, (1) 375.
Greek rendering of Ex. xxiv. 8, 438.
Historical books of Hebrew canon, (5) 185.
Ἱλασμός, (1) 287.
Ἱλαστήριον, 284.
Interpretation of John i. 29, 277.
—— 1 John i. 7, (4) 286.
—— Lev. xvii. 11, 103.
—— *nabhi*, 205.
—— *nasa*, 8.
—— trespass-offering, (2) 109.
Notes on—
Interpretation of *yazzeh*, 217.
Literature of apostolic doctrine, 291.
—— bloodless sacrifice, (3) 81.
—— Mosaism, 59.
—— priesthood, 69.
—— purification, 72.
—— sacrifices, 76.
—— Socinianism, 358.
—— Tabernacle, 64.
—— Temple, (9) 188.
—— times and seasons, 85.
Living water, (4) 74.
Minchah, (1) 34.
Nature of *shesh*, (4) 66.
Nethinim, (2) 69.
Non-dogmatic Christianity of Apostolic Fathers, 333.
Origin of sacrifice, (2) 41.
Paschal nature of eucharist, (2) 465.
Phrase, 1 Pet. i. 2, (8) 281.
Position of first covering of Tabernacle, (5) 65.
"Process of time," (3) 34.
Rabbinic interpretation of abstinence from wine, (6) 71.
Recognition of Abel's sacrifice, (3) 35.
Relation of sacrifice to prayer, 51.
Ritual of peace-offering, (3) 78.
Sacrificial interpretation of Eph. ii. 13, 18, (11) 285.
Shittim, (4) 65, (1) 121.
Translations adopted of poetical books, (6) 199.
Use of "redeemed" by Peter, (1) 282.
Use of *tsevach*, (1) 46.
Various interpretations of combustion, (1) 132.
—— imposition of hand, 129.
—— priest, (2) 96.
—— purification, 100.
—— Tabernacle, 95.
—— views of Aquinas on atonement of Christ, (2) 345.
Word *sacrament*, 461.
Year of crucifixion, 220.

Oehler, contributions to literature, of Mosaism, (1) 59.
—— of priesthood, (1) 69.
—— of purifications, (4) 72.
—— of sacrifices, (5) 76.
—— of Tabernacle, (1) 64.
—— of times and seasons, (7) 85.
—— on biblical method, (1) 19.
—— on continuity of Scripture, (1) 23.
—— on expiatory nature of patriarchal sacrifice, (1) 48.

Oehler, on form of cherubim, (1) 68.
—— on imposition of hand, (1) 129.
—— on interpretation of Lev. xvii. 11, (2) 103.
—— on origin of sacrifice, (1) 42.
—— on significance of *nabhi*, (1) 206.
—— on significance of trespass-offering, (1) 109.
—— on *yazzeh*, (2) 217.
—— place in study of Mosaism, 256.
—— quoted on aspersion of blood in sin-offering, 134.
—— quoted on kingdom of Israel, 190.
—— quoted on nature of prophecy, 205.
—— synonym of *shelamim*, 506.
Official offerings under Law, 84.
Oil, essential significance of, 109.
—— injunctions concerning, 82.
Olah, Hellenistic equivalents of, 519.
—— significance of, 506.
—— See *Burnt-Offering*.
Orelli, contribution to literature of feasts, (7) 85.
—— revising Oehler, (1) 59, (1) 69.
Origen, allegorical interpretation of Mosaic sacrifice, 227.
—— followers of, 232.
—— on *Azazel*, 522.
—— on *θυσία* and *δῶρον*, (1) 35.
Origin of sacrifice, 31.
—— views upon, (2) 41.
Outram, contribution to literature, of Mosaism, (1) 59.
—— of priesthood, (1) 69.
—— of sacrifices, (5) 76.
—— of tabernacle, (1) 64.
—— on anointing oil of priesthood, (1) 72.
—— on formula of confession accompanying imposition of hand, 147.
—— on imposition of hand, (1) 129.
—— on origin of sacrifice, (2) 41.
—— on relation between sacrifice and prayer, (1) 51.
—— place in study of Mosaism, 244.
—— quoted on distinction between symbol and type, (2) 159, 164.
—— synonym of *shelamim*, 506.
Owen, quoted, on prefigurement of Christ in ancient sacrifices, (1) 165.
—— on times and seasons of patriarchal sacrifices, (2) 46.
—— theory of atonement, 351.
Oxenham, quoted on atonement, 332, 333, 334, 374.

Padhah, Hellenistic equivalents of, 521.
—— significance of, 518.
Paradisaic sacrifice, 32.
Park, theory of atonement, (1) 368, 369.
Pascal, quoted, on figurative nature of Mosaism, 158.
—— on Jewish religion, 181.
Passover, essential significance of, 111.
—— injunctions concerning, 86.
—— transition to Mosaism, 61.
Patriarchal doctrine, difficulties in study of, 31.
—— non-evolutional, 31.
Patriarchal sacrifice, and forgiveness of sins, 48.
—— and religious life, 53.
—— development of, 44.
—— expiatory nature of, (1) 48.
—— origin of, 32.
—— summary of doctrine of, 53.
Paul, literature of doctrinal system of, (1) 291.
—— on sacrifice by man, 440.
—— on sacrificial nature of work of Christ, 283.
—— on atoning work of Christ, 294.
Paulus, on *Azazel*, 523.
—— *yazzeh*, 219.
Payne, on Calvinism, 367.
Payne Smith, quoted on Messianic Psalms, 201.
—— quoted on typical conception of Old Testament, (2) 155.
Peace-offering, antitype of, 457.
—— essential significance of, 105.
—— injunctions concerning, 78.
—— symbolism of, 136.
—— synonym of *shelamim*, 507.
Pentecost, injunctions concerning, 86.
—— essential significance of, 111.
Person of Christ, biblical conception of, 308.
Peter, literature of doctrinal system of, (1) 291.
—— on sacrifice by man, 440.
—— on sacrificial nature of work of Christ, 281.
—— on atoning work of Christ, 292.
Philippson, on *Azazel*, 523.
Philo, comparatively useless for study of Mosaism, 63.
—— contributions to literature, of Mosaism, 59.
—— of Tabernacle, (1) 64.
—— on position of Tabernacle in court, (1) 67.
—— on significance of Tabernacle, (1) 95.
—— synonym of *shelamim*, 506.
—— view on slaughtering by priests erroneous, (4) 77.

Piepenbring, contribution to literature of Mosaic injunctions, (1) 59.
Pliny, on dress of Egyptian priesthood, (4) 66.
Polycarp, theory of atonement, 333.
Prayer and sacrifice, relation between, (1) 51.
Prerequisites of priesthood, injunctions concerning, 70.
—— symbolism of, 125.
Presentation, essential significance of, 101.
—— symbolism of rite of, 128.
Priesthood, antitypically considered, 454.
—— duties of, in post-Mosaic times, (3) 70.
—— essential significance of, 96.
—— injunctions concerning, 70.
—— literature of, (1) 69.
—— meaning of, 96.
—— representation of work of Christ, 421.
—— symbolism of, 124.
Primitive sacrifice, non-evolutional, 32.
Privileges of priesthood, injunctions concerning, 70.
—— symbolism of, 125.
Prophecy, corollary from definition of, 206.
—— division of, 208.
—— nature of, 205.
—— sacrificial teaching of, 208.
—— task of, in relation to sacrifice, 208.
Προφήτης, signification of, (1) 205.
Prophetic, element in Mosaic sacrifice, 164.
—— estimate of Mosaic sacrifice, 208.
—— writings aided assimilation, 204.
Pseudo-Jonathan, on *Azazel*, 522.
Purification, antitype of, 455.
—— aqueous, 73.
—— as figuratively descriptive of work of Christ, 422.
—— bloody, 74.
—— essential significance of, 98.
—— injunctions concerning, 72.
—— Johannine conception of, (4) 286.
—— literature of, (4) 72.
—— national, 75.
—— of dead, 74.
—— of leper, 75.
—— symbolism of, 126.
—— various interpretations of, (1) 100.
Pusey, on seventy weeks, 530.
Pye Smith, on Calvinism, 367.
—— on Messianic conception of Patriarchs, (7) 52.
—— on origin of sacrifice, (2) 41.

Qorban, Hellenistic equivalents of, 520.
—— signification of, 513.

Rabbi Abarbanel, on origin of sacrifice, (2) 41.
—— Ben Gerson, (2) 41.
—— Jacob, quoted on Paradisaic sacrifice, 33.
Rabbinic formula of confession, 147.
—— interpretation of *asham*, 509.
—— interpretation of *Azazel*, 522.
—— interpretation of imposition of hand, (1) 129.
—— interpretation of Isa. liii., 524.
—— interpretation of priestly abstinence from wine, (6) 71.
—— interpretation of Tabernacle, (1) 95.
—— testimony to ritual of peace-offering, (4) 78.
Racovian Catechism, contribution to literature of atonement, (1) 358.
—— on nature of eucharist, 486.
Randles, theory of atonement, 368.
Ransom, Hebrew synonyms of, 486.
—— Mosaic injunctions concerning, 84.
—— Petrine conception of, (1) 282.
Raschi, contribution to literature of Mosaic sacrifices, (5) 76.
Recognition of Abel's sacrifice, 35.
Rectoral theory of atonement, 375.
Redemption. See *Ransom*.
Reinke, on *Azazel*, 522.
Reland, contribution to literature of Mosaism, (1) 59.
—— on *Azazel*, 522.
—— on blemishes of sacrificial victims, (2) 77.
—— synonym of *shelamim*, 506.
Relation, between prayer and sacrifice, (1) 51.
—— of Mosaic doctrine to religious life, 153.
—— of Mosaic doctrine to forgiveness of sins, 144.
—— of patriarchal doctrine to religious life, 53.
—— of patriarchal doctrine to remission of sins, 48.
Religious life and Mosaic doctrine, 153.
—— life and patriarchal doctrine, 53.
—— satisfaction of Mosaism acknowledged in Hagiographa, 197; in prophets, 209.
Remission of sins and Mosaic doctrine, 144.

Remission of sins and patriarchal doctrine, 48.
Renan, quoted on Semitic monotheism, 24.
Rest, as a sacrifice, 83.
Reusch, contribution to literature of seventy weeks, 530.
Reuss, contribution to literature of Pauline doctrine, (1) 291.
Revelation, testimony of Book of, to sacrificial nature of work of Christ, 287.
Review, of sacrificial theory of Bähr, 248.
—— of sacrificial theory of "Criticism," 259.
—— of sacrificial theory of Hengstenberg, 255.
—— of sacrificial theory of Kurtz, 256.
—— of sacrificial theory of Lowman, 246.
—— of sacrificial theory of Origen, 227.
—— of sacrificial theory of Outram, 244.
—— of sacrificial theory of Spencer, 237.
—— of theory of atonement of Abelard, 347.
—— of theory of atonement of Anselm, 340.
—— of theory of atonement of Arminians, 360.
—— of theory of atonement of Bushnell, 388.
—— of theory of atonement of Campbell, 376.
—— of theory of atonement of Curcellæus, 364.
—— of theory of atonement of Dale, 403.
—— of theory of atonement of Duns Scotus, 345.
—— of theory of atonement of Fathers, 334.
—— of theory of atonement of Gnostics, 336.
—— of theory of atonement of Grotius, 360.
—— of theory of atonement of Limborch, 364.
—— of theory of atonement of Unitarians, 357.
—— of theory of eucharist of Calvin, 487.
—— of theory of eucharist of Luther, 482.
—— of theory of eucharist of Rome, 472.
—— of theory of eucharist of Socinus, 486.
—— of theory of eucharist of Zwingli, 485.
Reynolds, quoted on Lamb of God, 278.
Riehm, contribution to literature of trespass-offering (2), 80.
—— contribution to literature of Mosaism, (1) 59.
—— contribution to literature of atonement, (1) 101.
—— on significance of trespass-offering, (2) 109.
Riggenbach, contribution to literature of Tabernacle, (1) 64.
—— on inner covering of Tabernacle, (5) 65.
Rink, contribution to literature of trespass-offering, (2) 80.
—— on significance of trespass-offering, (2) 109.
Ritschl, on imposition of hand, (1) 129.
—— place in study of Mosaism, 256.
—— quoted on history of atonement, (1) 338.
—— theory of atonement, 373.
Ritual, of sacrifice, antitypically considered, 455.
—— generally described, 128.
Robertson, quoted on persistency of truth, 472.
—— theory of atonement, 373.
Robinson, quoted on fat-tailed sheep, (1) 79.
Roman Catechism, quoted on nature of sacraments, 459.
Romanist theory of eucharist, 472.
Roscellinus, quoted on Abelard, 347.
Rosenmüller, on *Azazel*, 522.
—— on *yazzeh*, (2) 217.
—— on synonym of *shelamim*, 506.
Rückert, on Tertullian's use of *sacramentum*, (1) 461.

Saalschütz, on sanitary purpose of Mosaism, (3) 174.
—— on significance of purification, (1) 100.
Sabbath, essential significance of, 110.
Sabhal, interpretation of, (1) 218.
Sacerdotalism combated by doctrine of sacrifice, 25.
Sacrament, confusion of Tridentine definition of, 480.
—— etymology of, (1) 461.
—— nature of, 458.
—— of Lord's Supper. See *Eucharist*.
—— scriptural evidence upon, 463.
Sacramental nature, of Eucharist, 487.
—— of Mosaic sacrifices, 143.
—— of New Testament sacrifices, 461.
Sacrifice, antitypically considered, 455.
—— completion of cycle of, 496.
—— defined, 26.

Sacrifice, figuratively descriptive of work of Christ, 423.
—— general ritual of Mosaic, 128.
—— literature of Mosaic, (5) 76.
—— New Testament doctrine of, generally considered, 269.
—— New Testament, projected into eternity, 493.
—— of Christ generally considered, 272.
—— of covenant, 61.
—— of eucharist, 459.
—— of man generally considered, 272, 449.
—— of man, sacramental, 460.
—— vagueness of term, 26.
Sacrificial feasts, antitype of, 456.
—— injunctions concerning, 79.
—— symbolism of, 132.
Sacrificium propitiatorium, is the eucharist such, 480.
Salvador, contribution to literature of Mosaic injunctions, (1) 59.
Sanitary purpose of Mosaism, 174.
Sartorius, contribution to literature of sacramental significance of Mosaism, (2) 153.
—— quoted on Paradisaic sacrifices, 33.
Satanward theories of atonement, 374.
Saubert, contribution to literature of priesthood, (1) 69.
Schleiermacher, on biblical method, (1) 19.
—— on theory of atonement, 373.
Schleusner, on scriptural conception of death, 315.
Schlichting, contribution to literature of atonement, (1) 358.
Schlossberg's *Sifra*, (5) 76.
Schmidt, on biblical method, (1) 19.
Schöberlein, on expiatory nature of patriarchal sacrifice, (1) 49.
Schultz, contribution to literature, of Mosaism, (1) 59.
—— of priesthood, (1) 69.
—— of sacrifice, (5) 76.
—— of Tabernacle, (1) 64.
—— of times and seasons, (7) 85.
—— on *Azazel*, 523.
—— on imposition of hand, (1) 129.
Selden, contribution to literature of priesthood, (1) 69.
Septuagint, as an interpreter, 275.
—— on *θυσία* and *δῶρον*, (1) 35.
—— on *ἱλαστήριον*, (1) 284.
—— on interpretation of Lev. xvii. 11, (2) 103.
—— synonym of *shelamim*, 506.
Seventy weeks of Daniel, 219, 529.
Shechar, 82.
Shedd, quoted on absence of dogma in Apostolic Fathers, (1) 333.
Sheldrake, quoted on sin, 305.
Shesh, what, (4) 66.
Shewbread, essential significance of, 109.
—— etymology of, 82.
—— injunctions concerning, 82.
—— symbolism of, 139.
Shittim, what, (4) 65, 121.
Silver, employed in tabernacle, 66.
—— symbolism of, 121.
Simon, Principal, on governmental theory, (1) 375.
—— quoted on moral theories, (1) 370.
—— quoted on Schleiermacher, (4) 373.
—— quoted on classification of theories of atonement, (1) 372.
—— quoted on Maurice, (4) 375.
Sinlessness of Jesus, scriptural conception of, 309.
Sin-offering, antitype of, 456.
—— essential significance of, 106.
—— injunctions concerning, 79.
—— not trespass-offering, (3) 80.
—— symbolism of, 133.
—— synonym of *chattath*, 508.
Smalkald, Articles of, on eucharist, 483.
Smalley, theory of atonement, (1) 368.
Smyth, Newman, theory of atonement, 375.
Socinian, contribution to literature of atonement, (1) 358.
—— theory of eucharist, 486.
Socinus, quoted on eucharist, 486.
Sommer, on significance of purification, (1) 100.
Spencer, contribution to literature, of Mosaism, (1) 59.
—— of purification, (4) 72.
—— of sacrifices, (5) 76.
—— editions of works, (2) 237.
—— on *Azazel*, 522.
—— on form of cherubim, (1) 68.
—— on signification of purifying, (1) 100.
—— place in study of Mosaism, 237.
Spiritual sense of Origen, 229.
Spoils as offerings, 83.
—— essential significance of, 109.
Stanley, quoted on allegorical interpretations, 225.
—— quoted on Jews, 23.
Stäudlin, theory of atonement, 375.
Steudel, contribution to literature of sacrifices, (5) 76.
—— on *Azazel*, 523.
—— quoted on subjective side of Mosaic sacrifice, (6) 148.
Stöckl, contribution to literature of sacrifices, (5) 76.

Stöckl, on imposition of hand, (1) 129.
Storr, theory of atonement, 375.
Subjective side of sacrifice recognised in Hagiographa, 199.
—— in Law, 146.
—— in patriarchal age, 37, 45.
—— in prophets, 210.
Summary of biblico-theological theories of Old Testament sacrifice, 258.
—— of essential significance of Mosaic injunctions, 113.
—— of Christian sacrifice under New and Old Covenants, 457.
—— of Mosaic injunctions, 88.
—— of New Testament doctrine of atonement, 324.
—— of New Testament doctrine of atonement as compared with that of Old, 436.
—— of New Testament doctrine of Christian sacrifice, 448.
—— of New Testament doctrine of Christian sacrifice as expressed in sacrificial language, 450.
—— of New Testament doctrine of sacrifice, 458.
—— of sacramental significance of Mosaic injunctions, 156.
—— of symbolic significance of species of sacrifice, 137.
—— of typical significance of Mosaic injunctions, 170.
Sykes, on imposition of hand, (1) 129.
Symbolical significance of, acacia, 121.
—— ark of covenant, 122.
—— aspersion of blood, 129.
—— bloodless sacrifices, 137.
—— brass, 121.
—— burnt-offerings, 135.
—— cherubim, 122.
—— colours, 121.
—— combustion, 131.
—— concluding meal, 132.
—— gold, 121.
—— ground plan, 121.
—— horns of altar, 122.
—— imposition of hand, 128.
—— Mosaic injunctions generally, 115.
—— peace-offerings, 136.
—— priesthood, 124.
—— purification, 126.
—— silver, 121.
—— sin-offering, 133.
—— tabernacle, 120.
—— times and seasons, 140.
—— trespass-offering, 134.
Symbolism, canon for study of, 116.
—— what, 114.
—— where to be expected, 118.
Symmachus, on *Azazel*, 522.

Tabernacle, antitype of, 454.
—— essential significance of, 90.
—— figuratively descriptive of work of Christ, 420.
—— injunctions concerning, 64.
—— literature of, (1) 64.
—— symbolism of, 120.
—— various interpretations of, (1) 95.
Tabernacles, Feast of, injunctions concerning, 86.
Talmud, comparatively useless in study of Mosaism, 63.
—— contributions to literature of Mosaic sacrifices, (5) 76.
—— on north side, (4) 78.
—— on rite of waving, 136.
—— on Isa. liii., 492.
—— on *yazzeh*, (2) 217.
—— quoted on garments of priesthood, (8) 70.
Task of prophecy in relation to Mosaic sacrifice, 204, 208.
Taylor, quoted on patriarchal age, 30.
Temple, literature of, (1) 189.
Terminology of sacrifice in Hebrew and Greek, 505.
Tertullian, on origin of sacrifice, (2) 41.
—— on *sacramentum*, (1) 461.
Thalhofer, contribution to literature of bloodless sacrifices, (3) 81.
Thenius, contribution to literature of Temple, (1) 189.
—— on *yazzeh*, (2) 217.
Theodoret, on origin of sacrifice, (2) 41.
—— on *Azazel*, 522.
Theories, review of. See *Review*.
Theory, equivocal use of word, 327.
Thirty-nine Articles, on nature of sacrament, 460.
Tholuck, contribution to literature, of priesthood, (1) 69.
—— of sacrifices, (5) 76.
—— on *Azazel*, 523.
—— on imposition of hand, (1) 129.
—— on Paradisaic sacrifice, 33.
—— on significance of Tabernacle, (1) 95.
—— place in study of Mosaism, 256.
—— quoted on nature of type, 163.
—— quoted on non-Mosaic nature of division of law into moral and ceremonial, 150.
—— quoted on paschal controversy, 465.
—— quoted on significance of bloodless offerings, 139.
—— quoted on typical conception of Old Testament, 155.
—— synonym of *shelamim*, 506.

Thomson, on reddened ram's skin, 66.
—— on imposition of hand, (1) 129.
Times and seasons, essential significance of, 110.
—— injunctions concerning, 85.
—— literature of, (7) 85.
—— symbolism of, 140.
Tischendorf, on various readings, of eucharistic passages, (1) 280.
—— of text of Col. i. 14, (1) 286.
Tithes, essential significance of, 109.
—— injunctions concerning, 70, 71, 82.
Transition to New Testament doctrine, 269.
Transitional nature of Mosaism, announced by itself, 166.
—— announced by prophets, 211.
—— an argument for antitypical nature of New Testament atonement, 428.
Trespass-offerings, antitype of, 456.
—— essential significance of, 109.
—— injunctions concerning, 80.
—— not sin-offerings, (3) 80.
—— symbolism of, 134.
—— synonym of *asham*, 509.
Tridentine canons and decrees, quoted on eucharist, 473.
Tridentine Council, on nature of sacrament, 460.
Tsevach, meaning of, (1) 46, 511.
Tsevach shelamim, 506.
Turretin, on *Azazel*, 523.
Tylor, quoted on evolution, 32.
Type, nature of, (1) 159, 426.
—— value of, *before* and *after* antitype, 164.
Types of New Testament doctrine, 276, (1) 296.
Typical significance of Mosaic sacrifice, 158.

Ugolino, contribution to literature, of Mosaism, (1) 59.
—— of priesthood, (1) 69, (7) 71.
—— of purification, (4) 72.
—— of Tabernacle, (1) 64.
Umbreit, on *yazzeh*, (2) 217.
Uncleanness. See *Purification*.
Undivided monarchy, assimilation of doctrine during, 188.
Unitarian doctrine of atonement, 357.

Vaihinger, on *Azazel*, 523.
Value of type *before* and *after* antitype, 164.
Van Oosterzee, quoted on principles of Mosaism, 173.
Van Til, contribution to literature of Tabernacle, (1) 64.
Varro, on *sacramentum*, (1) 461.
Vatablus, on *Azazel*, 522.
Vater, on *Azazel*, 522.
Vestments of priesthood, essential significance of gift of, 109.
—— injunctions concerning, 71.
—— symbolism of, 124.
Veysie, quoted on figurative nature of Christ's death, 420.
Voluntary offering, Hebrew synonym of, 476.
Von Cölln, on *Azazel*, 522.
Von Gerlach, on form of cherubim, (1) 68.
Von Lengerke, on seventy weeks, 530.
Votive offering, Hebrew synonym of, 476.
Vulgate, on interpretation of Lev. xvii. 11, (2) 103.

Wangemann, contribution to literature, of Mosaism, (1) 59.
—— of priesthood, (1) 69.
—— of sacrifices, (5) 76.
—— of times and seasons, (7) 85.
—— on *Azazel*, 523.
—— on significance of trespass-offering, (1) 109, (1) 477.
Warburton, on nature of type, 163.
—— on origin of sacrifice, (2) 41.
—— on "process of time," (3) 34.
—— quoted on possibility of doctrine of atonement, 327.
—— quoted on sacrificial nature of Christ's death, (1) 289.
Wardlaw, on Calvinism, 367.
Warren, on New England Theology, 367.
Weeks, theory of atonement, (1) 368.
Weiss, contribution to literature of Petrine doctrine, (1) 289.
Wellhausen, contribution to literature of naturalistic theory of Old Testament, 259.
Westminster Confession, on nature of eucharist, 488.
—— on nature of sacrament, 460.
Wieseler, on date of crucifixion, (1) 223.
—— on seventy weeks, 530.
Wilberforce, theory of atonement, (1) 374.
Winer, on *Azazel*, 523.
—— on *yazzeh*, (2) 217.
—— on Zwinglian theory of eucharist, 485.
—— synonym of *shelamim*, 506.

Witsius, contribution to literature of Tabernacle, (1) 64.
—— on *Azazel*, 523.
Wood-offering, essential significance of, 109.
—— injunctions concerning, 82.
Work of Christ, as expressed in sacrificial language, 274.
—— as illustrated by priesthood, 421.
—— as illustrated by purifications, 422.
—— as illustrated by sacrifices, 423.
Work of Christ, as illustrated by Tabernacle, 420.
—— biblico-theological doctrine of, 275.
—— doctrine of, 297.
Wünsche, on Jewish interpretation of Isa. liii., 524.

Yazzeh, signification of, (2) 217.
Young, theory of atonement, 373.

ZWINGLI, theory of atonement, 349.
Zwinglian theory of eucharist, 485.

THE END.

MORRISON AND GIBB, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

In One Vol. 8vo, price 12s.,

AN INTRODUCTION TO THEOLOGY:

ITS PRINCIPLES,

ITS BRANCHES, ITS RESULTS, AND ITS LITERATURE.

By ALFRED CAVE, B.A., D.D.,

PRINCIPAL, AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, HACKNEY COLLEGE, LONDON.

SOME OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

E Pluribus Perpauca.

'I have just seen your excellent "Introduction to Theology," and feel prompted to thank you for this excellent help to students. I have been lecturing on this subject for forty years, and long wished for some such substitute for Hagenbach (too German to be translated or even reproduced), which I could recommend to my students.'—Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D.

'Cave's Encyclopædia pursues the practical aim of introducing beginners to the study of Theology, and fulfils this aim, so far as the reviewer is able to judge, in important fashion. The execution is luminous, clear, always keeps the main point in mind, and rests upon diligent knowledge of the subject. As regards the selection of literary aids, it must be acknowledged that the selection has been made with knowledge, caution, and skill.'—*Theologische Literaturzeitung.*

'Years of diligent research must have preceded the production of a work like this. It surveys the whole field of Theology, and offers to the student the guidance of which he stands most in need, carefully mapping out the ground to be traversed, showing the approaches to its several divisions, and specifying their peculiar features, their relations and inter-relations, putting us in possession of results which have been obtained, and indicating also the processes by which they have been reached. His long lists of books recommended to students at the end of each section are a tribute to his erudition and good judgment. He knows precisely the books which are of most service, and expresses in a few terse sentences, and often in a few words, his estimate of them. We can only say that we have rarely read a book with more cordial approval.'—*Baptist Magazine.*

'In reading this volume we have been over and over again delighted by the clearness of the distinctions drawn and the fulness of the information conveyed. Such a help in our student days would have been prized beyond all price. Especially to be commended is the admirable bibliography appended to each department. We cordially commend this volume as the best, indeed the *only*, sufficient handbook for students, and as one not likely to be superseded except by such enlarged editions as the progress of theological study may demand.'—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review.*

'A marvel of industry, and simply invaluable to theologians.'—*Clergyman's Magazine.*

Bible-Class Primers—*continued.*

ROBSON (JOHN, D.D.)—Outlines of Protestant Missions.
SALMOND (Prof.)—Life of Peter. The Shorter Catechism, 3 Parts. Life of Christ.
SCOTT (A.)—Life of Abraham.
SKINNER (J., Prof.)—Historical Connection between Old and New Testaments.
SMITH (H. W., D.D.)—Outlines of Early Church History.
THOMSON (P., M.A.)—Life of David. WALKER (W., M.A.)—The Kings of Israel.
WINTERBOTHAM (RAYNER, M.A.)—Life and Reign of Solomon.
WITHEROW (Prof.)—The History of the Reformation.

Blaikie (Prof. W. G.)—THE PREACHERS OF SCOTLAND FROM THE 6TH TO THE 19TH CENTURY. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Bleek's INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Bowman (T., M.A.)—EASY AND COMPLETE HEBREW COURSE. 8vo. Part I., 7s. 6d.; Part II., 10s. 6d.

Briggs (Prof.)—BIBLICAL STUDY: Its Principles, Methods, and History. Second Edition, post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

——— AMERICAN PRESBYTERIANISM. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

——— MESSIANIC PROPHECY. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

——— WHITHER? A Theological Question for the Times. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Brown (David, D.D.)—CHRIST'S SECOND COMING: Will it be Pre-Millennial? Seventh Edition, crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Bruce (A. B., D.D.)—THE TRAINING OF THE TWELVE; exhibiting the Twelve Disciples under Discipline for the Apostleship. 4th Ed., 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— THE HUMILIATION OF CHRIST. 3rd Ed., 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— THE KINGDOM OF GOD; or, Christ's Teaching according to the Synoptical Gospels. New Edition, 7s. 6d.

Buchanan (Professor)—THE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— ON COMFORT IN AFFLICTION. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

——— ON IMPROVEMENT OF AFFLICTION. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Bungener (Felix)—ROME AND THE COUNCIL IN 19TH CENTURY. Cr. 8vo, 5s.

Calvin's INSTITUTES OF CHRISTIAN RELIGION. (Translation.) 2 vols. 8vo, 14s.

Calvini Institutio Christianæ Religionis. Curavit A. THOLUCK. Two vols. 8vo, Subscription price, 14s.

Candlish (Prof. J. S., D.D.)—THE KINGDOM OF GOD, BIBLICALLY AND HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Caspari (C. E.)—A CHRONOLOGICAL AND GEOGRAPHICAL INTRODUCTION TO THE LIFE OF CHRIST. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Caspers (A.)—THE FOOTSTEPS OF CHRIST. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Cassel (Prof.)—COMMENTARY ON ESTHER. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Cave (Prof.)—THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE. Second Edition, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— AN INTRODUCTION TO THEOLOGY: Its Principles, its Branches, its Results, and its Literature. 8vo, 12s.

Christlieb (Dr.)—MODERN DOUBT AND CHRISTIAN BELIEF. Apologetic Lectures addressed to Earnest Seekers after Truth. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Cotterill—PEREGRINUS PROTEUS: Clement to the Corinthians, etc. 8vo, 12s.

——— MODERN CRITICISM: Clement's Epistles to Virgins, etc. 8vo, 5s.

Cremer (Professor)—BIBLICO-THEOLOGICAL LEXICON OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK. Third Edition, with Supplement, demy 4to, 38s.

Crippen (Rev. T. G.)—A POPULAR INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. 8vo, 9s.

Cunningham (Principal)—HISTORICAL THEOLOGY. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— DISCUSSIONS ON CHURCH PRINCIPLES. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Curtiss (Dr. S. I.)—THE LEVITICAL PRIESTS. Crown 8vo, 5s.

Dabney (R. L., D.D.)—THE SENSUALISTIC PHILOSOPHY OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY CONSIDERED. Crown 8vo, 6s.

Davidson (Professor)—An Introductory Hebrew Grammar. With Progressive Exercises in Reading and Writing. Ninth Edition, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Delitzsch (Prof.)—A System of Biblical Psychology. 8vo, 12s.

——— New Commentary on Genesis. Two Vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— Commentary on Job. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— Commentary on Psalms. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.

——— On the Proverbs of Solomon. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— On the Song of Solomon and Ecclesiastes. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— Old Testament History of Redemption. Cr. 8vo, 4s. 6d.

——— Commentary on Isaiah. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— On the Epistle to the Hebrews. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— Iris: Studies in Colour and Talks about Flowers. Post 8vo, 6s.

Doedes—Manual of New Testament Hermeneutics. Cr. 8vo, 3s.

Döllinger (Dr.)—Hippolytus and Callistus. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Dorner (Professor)—History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ. Five vols. 8vo, £2, 12s. 6d.

——— System of Christian Doctrine. Four vols. 8vo, £2, 2s.

——— System of Christian Ethics. 8vo, 14s.

Eadie (Professor)—Commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians. New and Revised Editions, Edited by Rev. Wm. Young, M.A. Three vols. 8vo, 10s. 6d. each; *or set*, 18s. *nett.*

Ebrard (Dr. J. H. A.)—The Gospel History. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— Commentary on the Epistles of St. John. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— Apologetics. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.

Elliott—On the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. 8vo, 6s.

Ernesti—Biblical Interpretation of New Testament. Two vols., 8s.

Ewald (Heinrich)—Syntax of the Hebrew Language of the Old Testament. 8vo, 8s. 6d.

——— Revelation: Its Nature and Record. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— Old and New Testament Theology. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Fairbairn (Prin.)—The Revelation of Law in Scripture, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— Ezekiel and the Book of his Prophecy. 4th Ed., 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— Prophecy Viewed in its Distinctive Nature, its Special Functions, and Proper Interpretations. Second Edition, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— New Testament Hermeneutical Manual. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Forbes (Prof.)—Symmetrical Structure of Scripture. 8vo, 8s. 6d.

——— Analytical Commentary on the Romans. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— Studies in the Book of Psalms. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

——— The Servant of the Lord in Isaiah xl.–lxvi. Cr. 8vo, 5s.

Frank (Prof. F. H.)—System of Christian Evidence. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Fyfe (James)—The Hereafter: Sheol, Hades, and Hell, the World to Come, and the Scripture Doctrine of Retribution according to Law. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Gebhardt (H.)—The Doctrine of the Apocalypse, and its Relation to the Doctrine of the Gospel and Epistles of John. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Gerlach—Commentary on the Pentateuch. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Gieseler (Dr. J. C. L.)—Ecclesiastical History. Four vols. 8vo, £2, 2s.

Gifford (Canon)—Voices of the Prophets. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Given (Rev. Prof. J. J.)—The Truths of Scripture in connection with Revelation, Inspiration, and the Canon. 8vo, 6s.

Glasgow (Prof.)—Apocalypse Translated and Expounded. 8vo, 10/6.

Gloag (Paton J., D.D.)—A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— The Messianic Prophecies. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Gloag (P. J., D.D.)—Introduction to the Pauline Epistles. 8vo, 12s.
——— Introduction to the Catholic Epistles. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
——— Exegetical Studies. Crown 8vo, 5s.
Godet (Prof.)—Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
——— Commentary on St. John's Gospel. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.
——— Commentary on Epistle to the Romans. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
——— Commentary on 1st Epistle to Corinthians. 2 vols. 8vo, 21s.
——— Lectures in Defence of the Christian Faith. Cr. 8vo, 6s.
Goebel (Siegfried)—The Parables of Jesus. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
Gotthold's Emblems; or, Invisible Things Understood by Things that are Made. Crown 8vo, 5s.
Grimm's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. Translated, Revised, and Enlarged by Joseph H. Thayer, D.D. Demy 4to, 36s.
Guyot (Arnold, LL.D.)—Creation; or, The Biblical Cosmogony in the Light of Modern Science. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 5s. 6d.
Hagenbach (Dr. K. R.)—History of Doctrines. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.
——— History of the Reformation. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
Hall (Rev. Newman, LL.B.)—The Lord's Prayer. 2nd Ed., cr. 8vo, 6s.
Hamilton (T., D.D.)—Beyond the Stars; or, Heaven, its Inhabitants, Occupations, and Life. Second Edition, crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.
Harless (Dr. C. A.)—System of Christian Ethics. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
Harris (Rev. S., D.D.)—The Philosophical Basis of Theism. 8vo, 12s.
——— The Self-Revelation of God. 8vo, 12s.
Haupt (Erich)—The First Epistle of St. John. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
Hävernick (H. A. Ch.)—Introduction to Old Testament. 10s. 6d.
Heard (Rev. J. B., M.A.)—The Tripartite Nature of Man—Spirit, Soul, and Body. Fifth Edition, crown 8vo, 6s.
——— Old and New Theology. A Constructive Critique. Cr. 8vo, 6s.
Hefele (Bishop)—A History of the Councils of the Church. Vol. I., to A.D. 325; Vol. II., A.D. 326 to 429. Vol. III., A.D. 431 to the close of the Council of Chalcedon, 451. 8vo, 12s. each.
Hengstenberg (Professor)—Commentary on Psalms. 3 vols. 8vo, 33s.
——— Commentary on the Book of Ecclesiastes, etc. 8vo, 9s.
——— The Prophecies of Ezekiel Elucidated. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
——— The Genuineness of Daniel, etc. 8vo, 12s.
——— History of the Kingdom of God. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
——— Christology of the Old Testament. Four vols. 8vo, £2, 2s.
——— On the Gospel of St. John. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
Herzog—Encyclopædia of Biblical, Historical, Doctrinal, and Practical Theology. *Based on the Real-Encyklopädie of Herzog, Plitt, and Hauck.* Edited by Prof. Schaff, D.D. In Three vols., price 24s. each.
——— Encyclopædia of Living Divines, etc., of all Denominations in Europe and America. (*Supplement to Herzog's Encyclopædia.*) Imp. 8vo, 8s.
Hutchison (John, D.D.)—Commentary on Thessalonians. 8vo, 9s.
——— Commentary on Philippians. 8vo, 7s. 6d.
Janet (Paul)—Final Causes. By Paul Janet, Member of the Institute. Translated from the French. Second Edition, demy 8vo, 12s.
——— The Theory of Morals. Demy 8vo, 10s. 6d.
Johnstone (Prof. R., D.D.)—Commentary on 1st Peter. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
Jones (E. E. C.)—Elements of Logic. 8vo, 7s. 6d.
Jouffroy—Philosophical Essays. Fcap. 8vo, 5s.
Kant—The Metaphysic of Ethics. Crown 8vo, 6s.
——— Philosophy of Law. Trans. by W. Hastie, B.D. Cr. 8vo, 5s.
Keil (Prof.)—Commentary on the Pentateuch. 3 vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.

Keil (Prof.)—Commentary on Joshua, Judges, and Ruth. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
——— Commentary on the Books of Samuel. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
——— Commentary on the Books of Kings. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
——— Commentary on Chronicles. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
——— Commentary on Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
——— Commentary on Jeremiah. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
——— Commentary on Ezekiel. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
——— Commentary on Daniel. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
——— On the Books of the Minor Prophets. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
——— Manual of Historico-Critical Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
——— Handbook of Biblical Archæology. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Keymer (Rev. N., M.A.)—Notes on Genesis. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d.

Killen (Prof.)—The Old Catholic Church; or, The History, Doctrine, Worship, and Polity of the Christians, traced to A.D. 755. 8vo, 9s.
——— The Ignatian Epistles Entirely Spurious. Cr. 8vo, 2s. 6d.
——— The Framework of the Church. 8vo, 9s.

König (Dr. F. E.)—The Religious History of Israel. Cr. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Krummacher (Dr. F. W.)—The Suffering Saviour; or, Meditations on the Last Days of the Sufferings of Christ. Eighth Edition, crown 8vo, 6s.
——— David, the King of Israel. Second Edition, cr. 8vo, 6s.
——— Autobiography. Crown 8vo, 6s.

Kurtz (Prof.)—Handbook of Church History. Two vols. 8vo, 15s.
——— History of the Old Covenant. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.

Ladd (Prof. G. T.)—The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture: A Critical, Historical, and Dogmatic Inquiry into the Origin and Nature of the Old and New Testaments. Two vols. 8vo, 1600 pp., 24s.

Laidlaw (Prof.)—The Bible Doctrine of Man. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Lane (Laura M.)—Life of Alexander Vinet. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Lange (J. P., D.D.)—The Life of our Lord Jesus Christ. Edited by Marcus Dods, D.D. 2nd Ed., in 4 vols. 8vo, Subscription price 28s.
——— Commentaries on the Old and New Testaments. Edited by Philip Schaff, D.D. Old Testament, 14 vols.; New Testament, 10 vols.; Apocrypha, 1 vol. Subscription price, nett, 15s. each.
——— On St. Matthew and St. Mark. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.
——— On the Gospel of St. Luke. Two vols. 8vo, 18s.
——— On the Gospel of St. John. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Lechler (Prof. G. V., D.D.)—The Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times. Their Diversity and Unity in Life and Doctrine. 2 vols. cr. 8vo, 16s.

Lehmann (Pastor)—Scenes from the Life of Jesus. Cr. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Lewis (Tayler, LL.D.)—The Six Days of Creation. Cr. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Lichtenberger (F., D.D.)—History of German Theology in the 19th Century. 8vo, 14s.

Lisco (F. G.)—Parables of Jesus Explained. Fcap. 8vo, 5s.

Lotze (Hermann)—Microcosmus: An Essay concerning Man and his relation to the World. Fourth Edition, two vols. 8vo (1450 pages), 36s.

Luthardt, Kahnis, and Brückner—The Church. Crown 8vo, 5s.

Luthardt (Prof.)—St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel. 7s. 6d.
——— St. John's Gospel Described and Explained according to its Peculiar Character. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.
——— Apologetic Lectures on the Fundamental (*Sixth Edition*), Saving (*Fifth Edition*), Moral Truths of Christianity (*Third Edition*). Three vols. crown 8vo, 6s. each.
——— History of Christian Ethics. Vol. I., 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Macdonald—Introduction to Pentateuch. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
——— The Creation and Fall. 8vo, 12s.
Mair (A., D.D.)—Studies in the Christian Evidences. Second Edition, crown 8vo, 6s.
Martensen (Bishop)—Christian Dogmatics: A Compendium of the Doctrines of Christianity. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
——— Christian Ethics. (General Ethics.) 8vo, 10s. 6d.
——— Christian Ethics. (Individual Ethics.) 8vo, 10s. 6d.
——— Christian Ethics. (Social Ethics.) 8vo, 10s. 6d.
Matheson (Geo., D.D.)—Growth of the Spirit of Christianity, from the First Century to the Dawn of the Lutheran Era. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
——— Aids to the Study of German Theology. 3rd Edition, 4s. 6d.
Meyer (Dr.)—Critical and Exegetical Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
——— On Mark and Luke. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
——— On St. John's Gospel. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
——— On Acts of the Apostles. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
——— On the Epistle to the Romans. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
——— On Corinthians. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
——— On Galatians. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
——— On Ephesians and Philemon. One vol. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
——— On Philippians and Colossians. One vol. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
——— On Thessalonians. (*Dr. Lünemann.*) One vol. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
——— The Pastoral Epistles. (*Dr. Huther.*) 8vo, 10s. 6d.
——— The Epistle to the Hebrews. (*Dr. Lünemann.*) 8vo, 10s. 6d.
——— St. James' and St. John's Epistles. (*Huther.*) 8vo, 10s. 6d.
——— Peter and Jude. (*Dr. Huther.*) One vol. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
Michie (Charles, M.A.)—Bible Words and Phrases. 18mo, 1s.
Monrad (Dr. D. G.)—The World of Prayer. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d.
Morgan (J., D.D.)—Scripture Testimony to the Holy Spirit. 7s. 6d.
——— Exposition of the First Epistle of John. 8vo, 7s. 6d.
Müller (Dr. Julius)—The Christian Doctrine of Sin. An entirely New Translation from the Fifth German Edition. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
Murphy (Professor)—Commentary on the Psalms. 8vo, 12s.
——— A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Exodus. 9s.
Naville (Ernest)—The Problem of Evil. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d.
——— The Christ. Translated by Rev. T. J. Després. Cr. 8vo, 4s. 6d.
——— Modern Physics: Studies Historical and Philosophical. Translated by Rev. Henry Downton, M.A. Crown 8vo, 5s.
Neander (Dr.)—General History of the Christian Religion and Church. Nine vols. 8vo, £3, 7s. 6d.
Nicoll (W. R., M.A.)—The Incarnate Saviour: A Life of Jesus Christ. Crown 8vo, 6s.
Novalis—Hymns and Thoughts on Religion. Crown 8vo, 4s.
Oehler (Prof.)—Theology of the Old Testament. 2 vols. 8vo, 21s.
Olshausen (Dr. H.)—Biblical Commentary on the Gospels and Acts. Four vols. 8vo, £2, 2s. *Cheaper Edition*, four vols. crown 8vo, 24s.
——— Romans. One vol. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
——— Corinthians. One vol. 8vo, 9s.
——— Philippians, Titus, and First Timothy. One vol. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
Oosterzee (Dr. Van)—The Year of Salvation. Words of Life for Every Day. A Book of Household Devotion. Two vols. 8vo, 6s. each.
——— Moses: A Biblical Study. Crown 8vo, 6s.

Orelli—Old Testament Prophecy of the Consummation of God's Kingdom. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— Commentary on Isaiah. 8vo, 10s. 6d. Jeremiah. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Owen (Dr. John)—Works. *Best and only Complete Edition.* Edited by Rev. Dr. Goold. Twenty-four vols. 8vo, Subscription price, £4, 4s. The '*Hebrews*' may be had separately, in Seven vols., £2, 2s. nett.

Philippi (F. A.)—Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. From the Third Improved Edition, by Rev. Professor Banks. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Piper—Lives of Leaders of Church Universal. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Popular Commentary on the New Testament. Edited by Philip Schaff, D.D. With Illustrations and Maps. Vol. I.—The Synoptical Gospels. Vol. II.—St. John's Gospel, and the Acts of the Apostles. Vol. III.—Romans to Philemon. Vol. IV.—Hebrews to Revelation. In Four vols. imperial 8vo, 12s. 6d. each.

Pressensé (Edward de)—The Redeemer: Discourses. Crown 8vo, 6s.

Pünjer (Bernhard)—History of the Christian Philosophy of Religion from the Reformation to Kant. 8vo, 16s.

Räbiger (Prof.)—Encyclopædia of Theology. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Rainy (Principal)—Delivery and Development of Christian Doctrine. (*The Fifth Series of the Cunningham Lectures.*) 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Reusch (Prof.)—Nature and the Bible: Lectures on the Mosaic History of Creation in Relation to Natural Science. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Reuss (Professor)—History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament. 640 pp. 8vo, 15s.

Ritter (Carl)—The Comparative Geography of Palestine and the Sinaitic Peninsula. Four vols. 8vo, 26s.

Robinson (Rev. S., D.D.)—Discourses on Redemption. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Robinson (E., D.D.)—Greek and Eng. Lexicon of the N. Test. 8vo, 9s.

Rothe (Prof.)—Sermons for the Christian Year. Cr. 8vo, 4s. 6d.

Saisset—Manual of Modern Pantheism. Two vols. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Sartorius (Dr. E.)—Doctrine of Divine Love. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Schaff (Professor)—History of the Christian Church. (New Edition, thoroughly Revised and Enlarged.)

——— Apostolic Christianity, A.D. 1–100. 2 vols. Ex. 8vo, 21s.

——— Ante-Nicene Christianity, A.D. 100–325. 2 vols. Ex. 8vo, 21s.

——— Post-Nicene Christianity, A.D. 325–600. 2 vols. Ex. 8vo, 21s.

——— Mediæval Christianity, A.D. 590–1073. 2 vols. Ex. 8vo, 21s. (*Completion of this Period*, 1073–1517, *in preparation.*)

——— Modern Christianity, A.D. 1517–1530. 2 vols. Ex. 8vo, 21s.

——— The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles. The Didachè and Kindred Documents in the Original. Second Edition, ex. 8vo, 9s.

Schleiermacher's Christmas Eve. Crown 8vo, 2s.

Schmid's Biblical Theology of the New Testament. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Schürer (Prof.)—History of the New Testament Times. Div. II. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.

Scott (Jas., M.A., D.D.)—Principles of New Testament Quotation Established and Applied to Biblical Criticism. Cr. 8vo, 2nd Edit., 4s.

Shedd—History of Christian Doctrine. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— Sermons to the Natural Man. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

——— Sermons to the Spiritual Man. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

——— Dogmatic Theology. Two vols. ex. 8vo, 25s.

Simon (Prin.)—The Bible; An Outgrowth of Theocratic Life. Cr. 8vo, 4/6.

——— The Redemption of Man. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Smeaton (Professor)—The Doctrine of the Atonement as Taught by Christ Himself. Second Edition, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Smeaton (Professor)—On the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Second Edition, 8vo, 9s.

Smith (Professor Thos., D.D.)—Mediæval Missions. Cr. 8vo, 4s. 6d.

Stählin (Leonh.)—Kant, Lotze, and Ritschl. 8vo, 9s.

Stalker (Jas., D.D.)—The Life of Jesus Christ. New Edition, in larger Type. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

——— Life of St. Paul. Large Type Edition. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Stanton (V. H., M.A.)—The Jewish and The Christian Messiah. A Study in the Earliest History of Christianity. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Steinmeyer (Dr. F. L.)—The Miracles of Our Lord. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

——— The History of the Passion and Resurrection of our Lord, considered in the Light of Modern Criticism. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Stevenson (Mrs.)—The Symbolic Parables: The Predictions of the Apocalypse in relation to the General Truths of Scripture. Cr. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Steward (Rev. G.)—Mediatorial Sovereignty. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— The Argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Stier (Dr. Rudolph)—On the Words of the Lord Jesus. Eight vols. 8vo, Subscription price of £2, 2s. Separate volumes, price 10s. 6d.

——— The Words of the Risen Saviour, and Commentary on the Epistle of St. James. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— The Words of the Apostles Expounded. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Tholuck (Prof.)—The Epistle to the Romans. Two vols. fcap. 8vo, 8s.

——— Light from the Cross. Third Edition, crown 8vo, 5s.

Tophel (Pastor G.)—The Work of the Holy Spirit. Cr. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Uhlhorn (G.)—Christian Charity in the Ancient Church. Cr. 8vo, 6s.

Ullmann (Dr. Carl)—Reformers before the Reformation, principally in Germany and the Netherlands. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— The Sinlessness of Jesus: An Evidence for Christianity. Fourth Edition, crown 8vo, 6s.

Urwick (W., M.A.)—The Servant of Jehovah: A Commentary upon Isaiah lii. 13–liii. 12; with Dissertations upon Isaiah xl.–lxvi. 8vo, 3s.

Vinet (Professor)—Studies on Blaise Pascal. Crown 8vo, 5s.

Vinet (Life and Writings of). By L. M. Lane. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Walker (J., D.D.)—Theology and Theologians of Scotland. New Edition, crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Watts (Professor)—The Newer Criticism and the Analogy of the Faith. Third Edition, crown 8vo, 5s.

——— The Reign of Causality: A Vindication of the Scientific Principle of Telic Causal Efficiency. Crown 8vo. 6s.

Weir (J. F., M.A.)—The Way: The Nature and Means of Salvation. Ex. crown 8vo, 6s. 6d.

Weiss (Prof.)—Biblical Theology of New Testament. 2 vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— Life of Christ. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.

White (Rev. M.)—Symbolical Numbers of Scripture. Cr. 8vo, 4s.

Williams—Select Vocabulary of Latin Etymology. Fcap. 8vo, 1s. 6d.

Winer (Dr. G. B.)—A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek, regarded as the Basis of New Testament Exegesis. Third Edition, edited by W. F. Moulton, D.D. Ninth English Edition, 8vo, 15s.

——— The Doctrines and Confessions of Christendom. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Witherow (Prof. T., D.D.)—The Form of the Christian Temple. 8vo, 10/6.

Workman (Prof. G. C.)—The Text of Jeremiah; or, A Critical Investigation of the Greek and Hebrew, with the Variations in the LXX Retranslated into the Original, and Explained. Post 8vo, 9s.

Wright (C. H., D.D.)—Biblical Essays. Crown 8vo, 5s.

Wuttke (Professor)—Christian Ethics. Two vols. 8vo, 12s. 6d.

PLEASE NOTICE
THIS BOOK MUST
BE PHOTOCOPIED
BEFORE USE

232.3 Q
C315

21399